THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1 MARCH Vol. XLIV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

'Able to Convict the Gainsayers'

NO Anglican Bishop since Colenso has had more admirers and more adversaries than the late Bishop Barnes of Birmingham. His critics were mainly ecclesiastics and his adherents mainly laymen. As deception lies hid in generalities we have selected three significant clerical verdicts, those of an Archbishop, a Diocesan Bishop and a Vicar, to illustrate the strength of clerical regard for a great and good man.

(1) Dr. Fisher, Primate of all England, addressing the Convocation of Canterbury after the retirement of Dr. Barnes said :

> 'It would be dishonest of me not to allude to the fact that among us and in the Church he has been the centre of much controversy and much difficulty . . .'
>
> 'On these controversies I do not wish to say a word, but I would like to say—as not many people, but some people, know—that, apart from his courtesy and kindness, there lay a simple, profound, personal faith in our Lord which he very rarely allowed to be seen.
>
> I think we all of us here knew that below all the storms there was that simple courtesy, courage and deep devotion.'

(2) Dr. G. F. Bell, the Bishop of Chichester, pronounced his verdict as follows :

> 'Bishop Barnes, in his prime, was one of the greatest preachers of his generation in the Church of England. He gave a marvellous ministry to which all churchmen owe a debt.
>
> Although there are many points on which we disagree, we have lost a bishop of great distinction and great courage, and we must not forget that he conceived it his mission, through thick and thin, through good report and ill report, to do his best to build a bridge between religion and science.'

(3) The Rev. F. S. W. Simpson, M.A., F.S.A., Vicar of Shoreham-by-Sea, records in his parish magazine (January, 1954):

'The death of the Rt. Rev. E. W. Barnes, D.Sc., D.D., F.R.S., up to a few months ago Bishop of Birmingham, has removed from our sight one of the most outspoken and outstanding members of the Bench of Bishops.

It was in the Birmingham Diocese that I held my previous benefice; and it is now fourteen years since I left it to serve as a Chaplain to the Forces.

Looking back dispassionately at my ministry there, I feel I can say:

1. That the Bishop was held in higher respect than any other member of the Bench by those outside the borders of the Church.

2. That he had within his diocese the most efficient and up-to-date body of Clergy I have ever come in contact with. They were realist and fully equipped and able to meet the opponents and critics of the Church on their own ground, and realised the problems of the man-in-the-street.

3. That the congregations of the Birmingham churches, although not large, had a greater percentage of men attending them than in any other diocese in which I have worked.

Many of his utterances and his attitude in sacred and secular matters were antagonistic and hostile to mine, yet I will venture to say, although it is too early to estimate his contribution to English Religious Life, that he will go down in the annals of our Church a much greater man than any of his critics either on or off the Bench. Even his most hostile opponents could not but admire his moral courage which he displayed on more than one occasion in a National crisis. His valiant attempt to reconcile traditional religious doctrine with the conclusions of modern science won for him the respect of many of the intelligentsia to whom the Church's outlook had ceased to make any appeal.'

What, however, is of more importance to the influence of the Christian Religion in the English-speaking world is the lay estimate of the significance of the late Bishop of Birmingham. For this estimate we are glad to have been able to secure the thoughtful appreciation of a distinguished, and many-sided, representative layman, Sir Henry Self, President of the Modern Churchmen's Union, which we publish in this issue of the *Modern Churchman*.

English Bishop Bans United Communion Service

The *Church Times* of January 15 records the following:

'The Bishop of Norwich has banned a united service of Holy Communion which had been arranged at St. Peter's, Thetford, for next Sunday by the Rector (the Rev. R. Jackson).

In a letter to the Rector, the Bishop stated that the service would not be in accordance with the Regulations of the Convocation of Canterbury. The united service will now take place in a local Baptist chapel.'

Fuller light is thrown on this incident by the following paragraph in the *Gloucestershire Echo* of January 9, under the heading ' Bishop Bans a Communion Service.'

> ' The planned united Holy Communion service at St. Peter's Church, Thetford, Norfolk, in which Free Church members were to have taken part on January 17, has been stopped by the Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Percy M. Herbert).
>
> The Rector of St. Peter's, the Rev. Reginald Jackson, received the following letter from the Bishop to-day : " The United Communion Service in connection with your share in the Universal Week of Prayer would not be in accordance with regulations adopted by Convocation. I fully realise that you thought you had my verbal sanction for this, but I must ask you to let it be known that the proposed service will not now take place. Yours very sincerely, Percy Norvic."
>
> Plans for the service, believed to be the first of its kind in the country, were announced earlier this week. It would have meant that people unconfirmed by an Anglican bishop would have partaken of the sacrament in an Anglican church.
>
> A United Communion Service will be held at Thetford Baptist Church on January 17 instead.'

On January 12 the *Gloucestershire Echo*, under the heading ' Regrettable ban on United Communion,' published two significant letters.

> ' Sir,—No doubt others as well as myself have been deeply shocked at your report in Saturday's issue of the Bishop of Norwich's ban on a United Communion Service at St. Peter's, Thetford.
>
> Convocation resolutions are not legal enactments. Convocation is not very representative, and at the moment has a majority of the less-liberal-minded section of the Church.
>
> A great Archbishop once declared that the Confirmation rubric was a domestic rule, and had nothing to do with the question of the hospitality of the Church to the Communicants of other Churches. Bearing in mind the history of the subject from the Reformation until now, he was most certainly correct.
>
> Happily there are many Church of England churches in which this hospitality to Communicants of other religious bodies is freely granted. In the parishes where I was Vicar I invariably granted it.
>
> It is certain that in the world to-day, dangerous and insecure as it is, anything that impedes the progress of Christian unity is a blow to the advancement of the Kingdom of God, and to be deeply deplored.'
>
> G. F. H. Elvey

The writer of this letter (son of the well-known composer of church music, Sir G. J. Elvey) was Vicar of Willingdon, Eastbourne, for some years. The second letter is from a Methodist minister :

> ' Sir,—In the report of the banning by the Bishop of Norwich of a United Communion Service, it is stated that such a service was believed to be the first of its kind in this country.

May I briefly report that twenty-five years ago, as a Methodist Minister in Bradford, where Dr. A. W. Perowne was the beloved Bishop, it was my privilege with many others to share in such a United Communion Service in a parish church and, to that united service Christians of all the Churches were invited and welcomed.

Does it not seem a pity that "The Lord's Supper" (as the Prayer Book calls it), meant at least to be "a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another" (Art. XXVIII), should, after 1900 years, rather reveal their lack of Christian unity, and "The Lord's Table" (as the Prayer Book calls it) the one place where "all Christian men alike" (Art. XXX) may not meet together to bear united witness to their one Lord?'

WILLIAM WATSON

The Rev. Reginald Jackson thus announced in his parish leaflet, *St. Peter's Pages*, the United Service which his bishop has banned :

'During the first complete week in January Christians of varying denominations all over the world will be assembling together for special prayer.

The arrangements here are as follows :

A United Meeting each evening, Monday (January 4th) to Friday at 7.30 p.m., in the Congregational Church, Earls Street.

Representatives of all the Anglican and Free Churches and the Salvation Army will be leading the meetings, and each evening will have its own subject as follows :

January 4th, Monday.	"The Word of God."
,, 5th, Tuesday.	"The Home and Education."
,, 6th, Wednesday.	"The Universal Church."
,, 7th, Thursday.	"Nations and Rulers."
,, 8th, Friday.	"Evangelization and Revival."

Please try to be present at the maximum number of meetings (all five if possible). If we Christians are in earnest about God's purpose for this world, such an opportunity as this week affords is not to be missed if we can help it.

THE UNITED COMMUNION SERVICE

This service is a climax to the week of prayer and was held last year in the Methodist Church. This year, with the acquiescence of the Bishop, it is to be at St. Peter's, and we shall hope to have joining with us at The Lord's table fellow Christians from the other Anglican and Free Churches of the town.

The service will follow Evening Prayer on January 17. It will be our usual Church of England form, conducted by the Rector. All St. Peter's Communicants are urged to give their support to this gesture of inter-Church fellowship.'

What concerns us is why the Rector of Thetford, at the command of his Bishop, has abandoned the United Communion Service to which he had publicly invited his communicant parishioners. We ask : Ought he not, as a firm believer in its

essentially Christian character, to have proceeded with the United Service and suffer the consequences of possible episcopal discipline?

We recall Dr. Henson defying an inhibition issued by Bishop Gore, and the Bishop having reflected, refrained from further action. It may be claimed that Dr. Henson's defiance was justifiable on the ground that faced with a conflict of loyalties between obedience to the Bishop and obedience to the Spirit of Christ he chose, in accordance with the apostolic precedent, obedience to the greater loyalty (*Acts* v, 29).

In yielding has not the Rector of Thetford conceded an authority to a resolution of Convocation which ought to be challenged in the interests of Christian Unity?

Roman Catholic Bishop Bans United Lord's Prayer

Under the heading of 'Christian Disunity' the *Church Times* of January 22 calls attention to the decision of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clifton forbidding the use of the Lord's Prayer at a local meeting of the Council of Christian Churches which was to have been attended by a Roman Catholic Representative. The Bishop of Bristol (Dr. Cockin), who presided at the meeting, prefaced it by saying he had written as follows to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clifton:

> 'I presumed that in accordance with the ruling of the Holy See, we should be in order in concluding with the Lord's Prayer.'

To this query the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clifton replied

> 'that after careful consideration, he had decided not to approve this practice at such gatherings since he feared it might give rise to misunderstanding.'

Dr. Cockin then read out another letter which he had received from the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clifton:

> 'I have never been entirely happy about our participation in these meetings. As you are aware, although we are most desirous that Christian unity be restored, it is the unalterable conviction of our faith that this can be brought about only by acceptance of the Catholic faith and submission to the Holy See. I have always feared that our participation in such joint meetings might arouse in some people's minds the idea that we might be induced to compromise. . . .
>
> Now, therefore, that the difficulty about the prayers has become acute, I judge it wiser for us to cease taking any part in such meetings.'

As a consequence of the Roman Catholic Bishop's decision, the Roman Catholic representative was absent from the subsequent meeting of the Council of Churches in Bristol.

M.C.U. Pronouncement on the Marriage of the Divorced

The following pronouncement authorized by the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union at its meeting on February 16 has received wide publicity in the Press and has excited hostile criticism in Anglo-Catholic circles. The M.C.U. pronouncement runs as follows:

> '1. We wholeheartedly support the bishops in their desire to safeguard the sanctity of marriage, and to emphasize the responsibilities attached to it.
>
> 2. We submit that this can best be done, not by restrictive regulations, but by leaving with those who have the direct pastoral responsibility and first-hand knowledge of the circumstances involved the discretion to act in the best interests both of the local Christian community and of those who earnestly desire to continue in its fellowship.
>
> 3. We submit that normally the exercise of this discretion could best be met by the authorization of some form of public service to be used in church following the civil marriage, it being made clear in the form of service itself that it is not a remarriage, but a service of prayer and dedication.
>
> 4. We are not prepared to regard those who have been through the divorce court as necessarily coming within the Prayer Book's category of "open and notorious evil livers," who shall be restrained from coming to holy communion or treated as excommunicated persons.
>
> 5. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the statutory right remains with an incumbent to conduct the remarriage of a divorced person in his church if, after careful inquiry, he thinks it right to do so. We would urge upon all incumbents their responsibility in this matter.
>
> 6. Finally, we would urge that the whole question of the treatment of divorced persons requires further study, with due regard to the responsibilities of the Church in upholding Christian ideals of marriage.'

This last suggestion (No. 6) has received weighty support from Dr. G. W. Butterworth in his letter to the *Times* of February 19.

'Woe Unto You Also, Ye Lawyers!'

Since the days of Colet, himself the son of a Lord Mayor of London, Deans of St. Paul's have exerted a notable Christian influence on English thought. Dean Matthews in these critical days is proving himself worthy of his decanal ancestry. His sermon delivered in St. Paul's on January 31 constituted a formidable indictment of the ecclesiastical legalism of our Church Assembly. *The Times* of February 1 summarizes the Dean's sermon as follows:

> 'One of the dangers of the welfare State is the excessive multiplication of laws and regulations,' he said. 'The position may be reached in which no one can possibly know all the laws which concern him and his activities, and this tends inevitably to a disregard, or even contempt,

of law. If laws are to be respected and cheerfully obeyed, they must be as clear and simple as possible and plainly reasonable in their intention.

These considerations apply even more obviously in the Church. From the point of view of the Christian Gospel, laws in the Christian fellowship are a sign of our imperfect love and obedience. They are no doubt a necessary evil. The Convocations of the Church of England are engaged on drawing up a revised series of canons which will be the law for the clergy and the faithful laity.

The existing canons of 1604 are certainly obsolete and perhaps needed revision. I see a danger in the very comprehensiveness of the proposed new canons. The attempt to regulate all the activities of the clergy and to cover every aspect of life may easily lead to a restriction of the pastoral freedom of the parish clergy.

It seems to me that one consequence of the canons may well be that the clergy will be afraid to do anything outside the ordinary routine of parochial duty without the permission of the bishop, and this, in the long run, will profoundly affect the status of the clergy and the nature of their ministry. What we need is not minute regulations but a few principles clearly stated and accepted by all, with freedom to apply these principles in the various circumstances of parish and people—laws few, clear, and reasonable.

I doubt very much whether the canons can be carried through without a conflict with the State, particularly those which apply to marriage and divorce. Do we want such a conflict now? Are we prepared for it? And if it comes, would the Church be united? These are questions which I hope our leaders have constantly in mind.'

In an editorial sub-leader of February 2, dealing with the Dean's sermon, *The Times* concluded with an aphorism worthy of Mr. Facing-both-ways:

'A surfeit of even good law can be harmful, but a mass of imprecise law is worse.'

Canonical Revision and Christian Freedom

The prophetic warning uttered by Dean Matthews followed by the editorial comment of *The Times* elicited a memorable and significant correspondence. On February 4 Canon J. L. Cartwright opened the correspondence with the following letter:

'Sir,—There must be a considerable number of members of the Church of England who share the misgivings about the proposed new canon law, which were expressed by the Dean of St. Paul's, and reported in your issue of February 1. This is all the more so, because the proposals seem to be part of a general tendency in the Church to emphasize and, I believe, to exaggerate the institutional side of the Christian religion, with a hardening and tightening of discipline, to the detriment of freedom of the spirit.

This legalism, issuing in codes of regulations as to conduct, and rigidity in the interpretation of doctrinal formulae, bears so strong a resemblance to the exclusiveness of the Pharisees, against which Jesus Christ and St. Paul protested, that it arouses grave disquiet. It is allied with a tendency to magnify the priestly at the expense of the prophetic function of the ministry. The operation of the Holy Spirit outside the

institution, the boundaries of which are defined in legal terms, is only grudgingly admitted. Spontaneity and adventurousness are discouraged.

The tendency is surely alien to the true vocation of the Church of England, and if allowed to prevail unchecked is bound to tend to exclude ordination candidates from whom much might be hoped in the future.

Yours faithfully,

J. L. CARTWRIGHT

18 Minster Precincts, Peterborough.'

The correspondence which followed covered a very wide range, including on the one hand a criticism of the Church policy of Canonical Revision as a whole and on the other hand the intense opposition aroused by the Revised Canons dealing with Marriage and Divorce.

Full appreciation of the significance of this correspondence can only be secured by reading the *whole* of it and we hope that *The Times* may decide at a later stage to publish it as a pamphlet, for it certainly deserves and should secure a wide circulation. All that we can do here is to cite a few significant extracts dealing with particular points.

First in importance among these comments is the Rev. T. J. Wood's confutation of the inference that opposition in the Church only possesses the support of a very small minority of the clergy. In his letter in *The Times* of February 5 he writes:

'In your leading article on canon law to-day it is stated that "All but a small minority of the clergy . . . hold that remarriage after divorce is contrary to the express teaching of Christ, and this conviction commits them to resisting the remarriage of divorced persons in church."

The Modern Churchmen's Union challenges that assertion and maintains that there is no evidence in support of it. On the contrary, the only concrete evidence on the matter was given in our evidence submitted to the royal commission. This showed that in 1947, in the Diocese of Chelmsford, 188 clergy were in favour of remarriage in church (where desirable) and 189 against, while in London (the most Anglo-catholic of dioceses) 218 were in favour and 290 for refusal.

Apart from these two cases we are not aware that the opinion of the rank and file of the clergy has ever been taken, and we have reason to believe that there is a large number of the clergy who are opposed to the rigorist attitude. We should like to see several bishops conduct an inquiry among their clergy to ascertain their views. Such a ballot would best be a secret one. Parochial church councils might be asked to vote on the question also: the clergy are not the sole repositories of the Christian conscience.'

This letter from the Hon. Secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union was followed on February 9 by a letter from the Rev. L. B. Cross, Chairman of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, which opened as follows:

'Many members of the Church of England and not a few of her clergy will welcome the significant trilogy of appeals for greater freedom

in pastoral work which recently appeared in your columns, namely, the report of a sermon preached in St. Paul's by the Dean, the statement by the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and the letter from Canon J. L. Cartwright. May I, as chairman of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, which has a membership of some 800 clergy of the Church of England, crave the hospitality of your columns to support their plea, especially in relation to the proposed new canon on marriage and divorce?'

In the same issue, *The Times* published a very weighty letter from Sir Alan Herbert, who secured the enactment by Parliament of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1937. He writes:

'I can say something of the intentions of the Parliament which passed the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1937: and in my book, *The Right to Marry,* I have told the whole story. Here are sayings from seven members of Standing Committee A, the only place where the clergy's "conscience clause" was thoroughly debated.

"The Clause says that it is left to the individual clergyman whether he chooses to marry the party, whether the guilty or innocent party, in church. We have always in the Church of England quite properly allowed a certain amount of latitude to individual clergymen in this matter." (Mr. Petherick.)

"It is quite right that the Bill should say that no clergyman of the Church of England should be compelled to do what he thinks is wrong. . . . To avoid all humbug it is just as well to leave the Bill to read that the clergy ought not to be coerced in any way." (Major Colfox.)

"It would equally be a great injury to the consciences of the clergy to forbid them to solemnize a marriage as it would be to compel them." (Sir Arnold Wilson.)

"The clergy should please themselves. Some, no doubt, with this Clause still in the Bill, will elect to marry divorced people. . . . Leave it to the individual conscience." (Mr. Sorensen.)

"In the Clause as it stands there is absolute freedom for any clergyman to act in accordance with his conscience. It is the intention of Parliament that no man's conscience should be coerced." (Mr. Henry Strauss.)

"The Clause says: 'No clergyman of the Church of England shall be compelled to solemnize.' That gives him liberty to solemnize the marriage of an innocent person." (Mr. Griffiths.)

"The Clause will remove a positive obligation which to some of the clergy was, and is, repugnant, and will leave the individual clergyman's conscience clear with regard to these matters." (Commander Agnew.)

After these expressions the Clause was carried without a division. . . . Parliament's desire was plain, individual liberty of conscience. . . . It would, perhaps, have been more firmly expressed if Parliament had realized how fierce a change of spirit was working in the Established Church. A little more than 50 years ago Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London, said: "We as Christians abhor divorce: but when a divorce has been judged necessary are we to refuse any liberty to the innocent or wronged party? It seems to me a matter of discretion on equitable grounds in each case. I could not advise any of my clergy to refuse to solemnize a marriage of an innocent party who genuinely desired God's blessing. I prefer to err on the side of charity."

In 1937, in the House of Lords, three Bishops spoke to the same effect. In 1954 we are discussing a proposed new canon which will make it an ecclesiastical offence to "give God's blessing to the innocent." What a pity! . . . The Established Church is looking for trouble—and, I fear, may deserve it. It prefers to err on the side of cruelty.'

The Right to Marry

In his letter Sir Alan Herbert 'shyly referred' to his recent volume, *The Right to Marry*. In this book he mentions the Modern Churchmen's Union of whose existence he was unaware until 1953.

'I then wrote, for the first time, to the Modern Churchmen's Union and to one or two individual clergymen for advice upon disputed points. I found from their prompt and encouraging replies that I was by no means a lone innocent abroad. Many of the arguments I had arrived at by myself had long been expressed (much better) in pamphlets and papers published by the Modern Churchmen's Union, and recently in the evidence they submitted to the Royal Commission on Divorce . . . even if I, who am interested, did not know of the existence of a strong and explicit body of minority opinion like the Modern Churchmen's Union, how much less will the general public, who have no time to read ecclesiastical treatises! I thought, therefore, that I might do some service to understanding by putting the whole story together in this form as clearly and fairly as I could' (p. 2).

Among 'Sundry Sayings' which prompted Sir A. P. Herbert to make his latest effort on behalf of humanity, sanity and morality in dealing with matrimony in our national life are:

(1) *The Bishop of Birmingham (Dr. Barnes) in the House of Lords*, 1937.—'The grounds on which divorce with the right of remarriage should be allowed must be determined by the conditions of the time . . . Every effort should be made to preserve the stability of family life, to keep the home inviolate, so that children may thrive in its wholesome shelter. But when the marriage tie has become unbearable through wrongdoing, or in very rare cases, the misfortune of one of the partners, then I say the Church should acquiesce in the ending of the union, and may rightly bless the other partner's attempt to make a new home' (p. 4).

(2) *Dean Rashdall.*—'That Christian people should be found stumping the country with the assertion "that the Christian Church has always condemned divorce" really amounts to a public scandal. Such an assertion must be based upon sheer ignorance or sheer disregard for truth' (p. 7).

(3) *Archbishop Davidson.*—'If justification were to be pleaded for such refusal of Holy Communion it must presumably be based upon the Rubric which allows and enjoins the exclusion of "an open and notorious evil liver." It is in my judgment impossible rightly to apply these words on account of their marriage to a man and wife who have contracted a marriage expressly sanctioned by English law' (p. 51).

Lord Hailsham Intervenes

The letter of Sir Alan Herbert, sometime M.P. for the University of Oxford, was followed on February 13 by a letter from Lord Hailsham, sometime M.P. for Oxford. From the closely reasoned protest which Lord Hailsham's letter expressed we cite two points not emphasized by other correspondents:

> '(1) Every civilized system of the law and every rational system of morals relating to contract contains some provision to the effect that if one party to a bargain wholly repudiate their obligations thereunder the other party at their option may be released from performance. It follows from this that it is altogether unarguable and, quite apart from its being a gross breach of Christian charity, it is intolerable to many conscientious people that it should be argued . . . that all persons who exercise the right of petitioning for divorce are thereby breaking their marriage vows. . . .
>
> (2) One objection to the proposed new canon is that it seeks by a majority vote to impose on all members of the Church of England a standard expression shown not to be the universal view of Christians generally or of members of the Church of England or of the Anglican Communion.'

'Hear the Conclusion of the Whole Matter'

We close our selection of extracts from this illuminating correspondence in *The Times* with a letter written by one who would decline the label 'Modern Churchman' but whose argument against proceeding with the present canon law revision is none the less both valid and arresting:

> 'Sir,—The real objection to the present proposals for a revision of canon law is that its aim is not merely to restore discipline but to alter the character of the Church of England. Whatever may be said of the insignificance of the minority of those clergy who are ready to re-marry divorced persons in certain circumstances, the fact is that the exceptive clause of Matthew v is part of the Canonical Scriptures, so that an invariable prohibition (as in Canon XXXVIII) is a clear departure from the position of the Church according to the Thirty-Nine Articles, one of which reads:
>
> > "... And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written. . . . Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet . . . it ought not to decree anything against the same. . . ."
>
> Canon XVII departs from the position of the reformers that vestments have a doctrinal significance and would re-introduce the Mass vestments discarded on this account at the Reformation. Nor is this but an academic question. Seeing that men have already been refused ordination because of their conscientious objection to the use of the stole there appears to be considerable ground for fear lest what would be permissive under the canon should soon become compulsory under some of the bishops.

> The Confirmation Rubric, frequently expounded by leading authorities past and present as a domestic rule for our own members, now appears in a new situation in Canon XXI to impose a virtual ban upon all intercommunion with members of the Free Churches. But perhaps the most serious of all is the constitutional issue raised in Canon XIII which takes from Parliament its right of veto in the matter of Prayer Book revision (which it so wisely exercised in 1927 and 1928) by laying down a new definition of lawful authority. One wonders if anything would have been heard of canon law revision if Parliament had tamely given what it was asked for on that historic occasion.
>
> Yours faithfully,
>
> DESMOND K. DEAN
>
> The Rectory, Tooting, S.W.17.'

The strategic quality which perhaps more than any other characterized the triumphant generalship of the great Duke of Wellington was that he knew when to retreat and how to retreat. May we not hope that the Primate of all England is also endowed with this combination of prophetic foresight and moral courage?

The Times in its leader of February 20, entitled 'Anxious Churchmen' writes:

> 'Many of the new canons will eventually have to be approved by Parliament but Convocation and the Church Assembly have the initiative, and the modest measure of autonomy thus accorded to the Church is a precious possession which will not be lightly forfeited.'

We can feel assured that this policy appeals to our Primate. *The Times* concludes its leader with another apothegm inspired by Mr. Facing-both-ways:

> '. . . The mind of the Church of England must never be closed to the re-examination even of its most fundamental beliefs. But the rule of Anglican churchmanship is to combine inquiry with discipline and, until and unless the Church's mind has been maturely and deliberately changed, it must remain faithful to what it has received from the past.'

And may we add: drop the project of revising the Canons of 1604.

PROBLEMS AND PRACTICE OF SPIRITUAL HEALING

The appointment of a Commission by our English Archbishops to examine the problems and opportunities presented to the Churches by the modern revival of spiritual healing, has created renewed interest, not only in clerical and medical circles, but among an increasing number of the public which declares itself to be in grievous need of a *practical* religion.

Whether this much to be desired practical religion is in this sphere the best kind of religion or even religion at all we cannot discuss here.

Mary Baker (1821-1910), better known as Mrs. Eddy, a

native of U.S.A., a farmer's daughter, after two unsatisfactory marriages became acquainted at the age of forty with Quimby, a 'magnetizer' who made use of hypnotic suggestion for the cure of complaints and became a 'pioneer in the use of suggestive therapy.' He, a student of the Bible although declared by some to be an atheist, believed that he had discovered Christ's secret as a healer. Quimby, who composed ten volumes in manuscript, entitled his technique the *Science of Health* or the *Science of Christ* and once or twice uses the term *Christian Science*.

Mary Eddy, a victim of acute hysteria, went to Quimby to secure relief. He healed her; she became his secretary and when he died she secured possession of his writings and produced from them her amazing book: *Science and Health: with Key to the Scriptures*.

Quimby was a sincere philanthropist but not a trained scientist. What shall we say of Mrs. Eddy? She is an enigma and many writers, ranging from Mark Twain to H. A. L. Fisher, have published analyses of her personality. What is clear is that she had immense belief in what she had got from Quimby and an intense conviction that it was her destiny to reveal it to mankind. She was educationally ignorant, inconceivably daring and undoubtedly an exhibitionist. She did, however, believe in her system and, like Wm. Cowper's lace maker, 'knew and only knew her bible true.' Nevertheless her exposition of Bible teaching abounds with absurdities. When she died she left a property worth one and a half million dollars, a highly organized institution and a large multitude of intelligent people, especially in U.S.A., who believed in her and in her Scriptural Science of health. It is incredible but true that Mrs. Eddy—and it shocks many—should have become in the modern world the most influential agent of the movement variously known as Spiritual healing or Faith healing or Divine healing. This is true, for example, of the excellent Emmanuel Church Movement in Boston organized by Dr. Worcester and Dr. McComb. When an English visitor asked a New Yorker: What is this Emmanuel Movement? he replied: 'It is Christian Science with the addition of a little Worcester sauce.'

Our English Guild of Health founded in 1903 (and so has achieved its Jubilee) owes its origin to 'Christian Science,' and without arrogance it may claim to be much more scientific and much more Christian than the original Eddyism. Its aims which it would be hard to better are four:

(1) To bring together Christian people, including doctors, psychologists, and ministers of religion, to work in fellowship for fuller health both for the individual and the community.

(2) To enable all members to study the interaction between physical, mental, and spiritual factors in well-being.
(3) To sustain and strengthen by prayer the sick, those who minister to them, and all those who exercise the divine gift of healing.
(4) To help men and women to realize in themselves, as members of the Christian family, the abundant life offered in Christ.[1]

We have no doubt but that it is on these lines that the Archbishops' Commission will endeavour to go forward.

May we add that of the great library of books on hypnotic therapy there are two contributions which we recommend whole-heartedly to all who have not read them—Dr. Leslie Weatherhead's *Psychology, Religion and Healing* (Hodder and Stoughton, second edition revised, 1952; 25/-) and *Healing Through Prayer* (Epworth Press; 1/-).

ERNEST WILLIAM BARNES, Sc.D., F.R.S.

By Sir Henry Self, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., K.B.E., President of the Modern Churchmen's Union

THE invitation to write this *In Memoriam* was extended to the writer as President of the Modern Churchmen's Union. For no other reason could he presume to approach the task; yet it may not be inappropriate that the work of this great pioneer should be appreciated in this Journal by a layman who has witnessed at first-hand the manner in which the informed laity have responded to the Bishop's courageous thinking and fearless interpretation of the historic faith in the light of modern knowledge. It is probably true to say that no man of recent times has had a more profound effect within the ranks of intelligent people, and particularly those who have felt compelled to honour their intellectual conscience and face the grim possibility of having to surrender outmoded religious credal beliefs. But for a guide such as Barnes, the surrender must have meant to most of them the further surrender of faith in Christianity itself. No single man in the twentieth century has done more to retain the informed laity of Britain within the Christian Church. This could, of course, only have been done at the price of bitter hostility from the ultra-conservative

[1] *A Guide to Spiritual Healing*. By the Very Rev. H. C. Robins (p. 36 f.). (Mowbray and Co., 1954; 7/6.)
The *Expository Times* (January, 1954) contains a succinct article by Rev. Robert Leaney, M.A., B.D., entitled 'Dominical Authority for the Ministry of Healing.'

element and yet they should, in fact, be the first to pay tribute to one who has done so much to keep bright the torch of spiritual life in this land.

It is no part of this article to review Barnes' life; the details have been fully set out in obituary notices in *The Times* and the *Manchester Guardian* of November 30, 1953. Those reviews depict the man with an intimacy of touch which will more truly reveal him in himself than any treatment at second hand here. Both articles were obviously written by close personal associates. There is also naturally a very warm reference to him in the *Old Edwardians Gazette* of December 1953. One meets in almost every field of activity men who have come from King Edward's School, Birmingham, but none of its old scholars could possibly have better manifested in himself the value of such schools than Bishop Barnes.

The treatment proposed here is rather to show Barnes' significance for thought and life in the Church of England in an age when spiritual insight was in danger of being jettisoned in a materialistic world harassed to its depths by two world wars within the working life of one generation. Barnes has with justice been compared with the great trio of Edwardian Bishops, viz. : Benson, Lightfoot and Westcott. He undoubtedly carried on their work, but it is also relevant to associate him with those great pioneers of English modernism, viz. : F. J. A. Hort, Dean Hastings Rashdall and Dean Inge. We see a group of seven men, representing in the first trio the central view-point of the Church, with a ready ear for the liberal interpretation, followed by the second trio, outspokenly presenting a modern treatment of Christian thinking in a manner which compelled public attention and ensured the standing of the Church through the present century : Barnes was a worthy successor of both groups and in his own person blended the characteristic themes and spirituality of both sides.

It would be an interesting study to go back and see how, from time to time, small groups of men, as in this case, have come forward and established spiritual thinking on a new high level; for example the classic era of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle or the Alexandrian and Antiochene Schools of the early Christian centuries, or the thirteenth century when we had the combination of St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas Aquinas, Bishop Grosseteste and Roger Bacon—a team which seemed to put Christianity in the forefront of modern development over the whole field at that time. The next group is obviously the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century focusing in Benjamin Whichcote, John Smith, Henry More and Ralph Cudworth. It is perhaps true to

say that this group is very much in line with the second trio mentioned above of which Barnes represented the culminating phase. Indeed, in order to get the appropriate treatment of Barnes' position one cannot do better than recall one or two features of the Cambridge Platonists which so clearly came to a fresh focus in Barnes.

Whichcote was strong against ecclesiastical bigotry and emphatic upon the status of reason; and by reason he meant that spiritual insight which is the 'candle of the Lord within us,' *Proverbs* xx, v. 27. John Smith sought to express a full spiritual and sacramental interpretation of the universe by the guidance of that spiritual insight. It came to particular expression in the Logos philosophy which was the hallmark of the Cambridge Platonists. Henry More with his great spirituality, kindly charm and readiness to sacrifice worldly prestige, gave a scientific interpretation of the universe in terms of 'the Spirit of Nature' which contrasted not unfavourably with the 'ether' theories of his contemporaries, Boyle and Newton. Finally, it was Cudworth who steadily maintained the banner against scientific materialism as propounded by Hobbes with his notions that atoms can 'think.'

These four men of the seventeenth century must have rejoiced to see the efforts made by E. W. Barnes in the twentieth century. All these aspects of the Cambridge Platonists were clearly in Barnes' general outlook. He was emphatic on the status of human reason but albeit as a spiritual force within man bringing his labour after truth to that clearness of vision which can only be achieved by the blending of religious philosophy with true scientific insight. This was typified by his great Gifford Lectures (1927-9) entitled, *Scientific Theory and Religion* or *The World Described by Science and its Spiritual Interpretation.* This work has not received the recognition it deserves. It presented a mathematical and scientific review of the universe as a preliminary to bringing together the world's religious and philosophical development. As such it offered a clear presentation to the thinking public of what was a reasonable interpretation of the universe by a Christian, who combined in his person a full scientific qualfication with the spiritual but rational insight springing from religious experience rightly understood. This was for Barnes, an essential preliminary to an exposition of the Christian faith in its particular essentials parallel to that achieved by John Smith; Barnes' approach was essentially sacramental in all its aspects. Moreover, his philosophy was Christocentric and Christologically sound because it was based upon the Logos principle as the Christ-Spirit in all its field of application. This was unfortunately blurred by

the sacramental controversy in which he was so misunderstood because he was prepared to discuss the matter against the background of thinking men of scientific experience who are not ready to surrender their science to doctrinal dogmatism unfounded in experience. Much misconception was based upon Barnes' frank requirement that these criticisms of the scientific world should be faced fair and square.

This attitude of mind was reminiscent of the standpoint of Henry More, whilst the personal characteristics which were so manifest in More seemed to come to an equally clear expression in the outstanding personality, courtesy and charm of E. W. Barnes. From everybody who experienced relationships with him, one can recapture incidents of his personal touch and help which showed the inner character of the man. Yet this great charm was combined with a very clear determination to maintain the true rational and philosophical basis of the Christian faith: this came out in his *apologia*, *Should Such a Faith Offend?* The book offered selections from his many endeavours to put the Christian faith in its several aspects, and there can be little doubt how high he stood in the public estimation in the presentation of the rational basis of Christianity. It was unfortunate that his later work, which caused so much controversy, *The Rise of Christianity*, should have been tinged with a certain relentlessness in presentation which led to oversight of the basic purpose of the volume: for courage and sincerity it could not be questioned. There have been criticisms of the scholarship of the work, but to a layman who has read many such treatments in an endeavour to get an understanding of the basic issues the criticism must be regarded as not seriously germane. The basic issues in their particular relevance were, in the opinion of most thinking men, clearly probed and truly presented.

In the fourth field, in the same way as Cudworth endeavoured to counteract the diverse principles of Hobbes, in their effect on cosmology and in their implications for civic life, educational affairs and great political issues, Barnes was a very worthy successor to Cudworth. His rebuttal of scientific materialism was intense. At the same time his courage in facing the problems of a large diocese and its administration, combined with his unhesitating rebukes from the pulpit on all issues of public policy, whatever the occasion, and his forcefulness and self-forgetfulness in his extreme actions to drive home his pacifism—all these factors mark the man as a prophet who would provoke the stoning which was so quickly forthcoming from all the vested interests which he did not hesitate to assail. He himself should not have been,

and doubtless was not, surprised at this 'stoning'; indeed, he invited it by the austerity and stern relentlessness of his public utterances, which contrasted markedly with his personal charm in private.

This preliminary approach requires to be amplified by fuller reference to some of his more specific fields of pioneering. One would imagine that he himself would regard his Gifford Lectures as his basic contribution to the modern interpretation of Christianity. They were directed to the discernment of the essentials of religion in the light of modern knowledge; as such, and in accordance with the terms of the Gifford Trust, they do not concern the presentation of Christian doctrine. This is an important consideration, in view of the criticism expressed in some quarters that Barnes was more of a scientist than a Christian; he was a scientist and a mathematician of standing, having been elected F.R.S. at the age of thirty-five years, but he was also a great Christian who saw how necessary it is in this the twentieth century to establish the status of religious experience as such as a prior clarification before attempting the exposition of Christian doctrine as the highest expression of that religious experience. Here, he showed himself a true reader of the signs of the times; modern scepticism goes to the roots of religious experience itself and a prior case must be established for its validity in the face of the scientific revolution. It was Barnes' view that theology cannot be based solely on religious experience; it must take account of the God of Nature as revealed by science. In this, as he acknowledges, he was in the line of succession from Hastings Rashdall and F. J. A. Hort.

His own philosophical position was that of a moderate realism, believing that a physical world exists independently of any human mind. With Rashdall, he postulated a certain community of nature between God and man and that 'in the highest ideals which the human conscience recognises there is a revelation of the ideal eternally present in the Divine Mind' (*op. cit.*, p. 7). In physical science as in morality, knowledge is the discovery of that which was there beforehand to be discovered. It follows that even in science we are never free from possible errors of perception, as he proceeded to demonstrate. Barnes' own interpretation is in its initial stages primarily that of a mathematician following the lead of such men as Roger Bacon and Robert Boyle; but again Barnes is quick to acknowledge the probability of error, and the fact that, even with geometry, we do not 'touch reality with the finger.'

But his mathematics is only preliminary, and as he passes on to his survey of science in all its aspects, he lingers over the

implications on the macrocosmic scale of the vastness of the physical cosmos now revealed to man. The scale may seem to dwarf man to insignificance, yet this also reflects man's greatness in his exploration of the cosmos.

> 'Is there not in such facts an indication that neither in time nor in space is man's mind limited to his body? Are we not encouraged thereby to speculate that when the body decays the mind survives? That the cosmos of inference may become the cosmos of experience is, I think, not an impossible hope' (*op. cit.*, p. 395).

It was Barnes' view

> 'that there is reason to believe that life exists throughout the whole cosmos and that in many places its development has reached stages immeasurably in advance of that attained by man upon the earth' (*op. cit.*, p. 403).

He anticipated much of recent speculation as to the formation of matter (for him, helium built up from hydrogen) from radiation in interstellar space, yielding a balance to the recession of the celestial bodies in an expanding universe accompanied by the probable annihilation of matter in the process. Yet ours is apparently a young universe with Time as a real dimension of its process, having a principle of significance in the law of entropy.

> 'It is because throughout the physical Universe I find thought and plan and power that behind it I see God as creator' (*op. cit.*, p. 409).

The spiritual father speaks in moving terms:

> 'There are many to-day for whom old certainties have vanished, the old faith has crumpled. I would have them look around. Everywhere, to those who have eyes to see, is the power and the presence of the Lord of Hosts' (*op. cit.*, p. 410).

Side by side with the cosmic process, he sees the evolutionary process in Nature, out of which, however blunderingly, comes man. It is in man that the Christ-Spirit is manifest and the Christ-Spirit is as real as the process of which it is apparently the climax.

> 'God demands from man willing obedience to the purpose of His creation; and this purpose, according to Jesus, is the growth within and through us of the Christ-Spirit' (*op. cit.*, p. 523). 'However grave be the difficulties raised by the problem of evil, we must affirm that the whole of creation is a revelation of God. . . . Nature is not to be likened to a blind giant, irrational, purposeless, knowing neither good nor evil, against whom man must wage war. She is God's process; and we are children of her womb, brought forth by the divine plan that we may become sons of God' (*op. cit.*, p. 589).

Even the mystic can claim no supernatural gift of perception; his mysticism is profoundly natural. In Baillie's words, religion is a

'moral trust in reality' and the universe is steeped in moral values. Barnes gives on page 620 a moving description of personal experience of the mystical approach through Nature.

With Dean Inge, Barnes was always emphatic on the objective reality of Absolute Values which are valid as attributes of God. Here is the basis of the adventure of faith to which the Christian is committed; any faith in God worth having will be based on the belief that the values of Goodness, Beauty and Truth reveal the Divine nature. God is their source as they are manifested in us, when we grow aright. This growth should emerge sooner or later in individual 'conversion,' conceived as the 'consecration of personality.' Barnes looked for the time when such conversion

> 'will become once again a great spiritual force. It will be associated, not with fundamentalism, but with a belief that the world described by science is the realm of God. The Bible will be, not a miracle of infallibility, but a storehouse of spiritual treasure' (*op. cit.*, p. 617).

With such a belief in God must be associated a belief in immortality. Harmony between the nature of God as revealed by Christ and man's place in the scheme of things cannot obtain

> 'unless this life is a probation or, more probably, an education for another which shall be both fuller and better. If the Universe be rational, man's potentialities must have opportunities of realization; and on earth such opportunities do not come to the majority of men' (*op. cit.*, p. 645).

Here was the striving of a great Christian for the future that should lie ahead for Christianity. It was his view that 'both the moral and intellectual essentials of the Christian outlook will survive any temporary eclipse.' There is no ultimate inconsistency between belief in God as revealed by Christ and acceptance of the standpoint created by modern science. This was the recurring theme of this champion of a comprehensive outlook on life. Modern knowledge, rightly understood, does not overthrow but rather reinforces the basic conviction that

> 'behind the world, controlling Nature, is the Creative Spirit to Whom we are somehow akin. That Spirit is not a cold foe working through blind and pitiless forces; but is the source of our aspirations, friendly to our search for knowledge, the kindly guardian of our destinies. Therefore I am certain that our search will not end with death: labour and struggle will not be in vain. At last we shall know even as we are known' (*op. cit.*, pp. 656-7).

It would be impossible in the space available to deal with the large number of papers and addresses delivered by Barnes; many of them are printed in past numbers of the *Modern Churchman* and we must concentrate on his main efforts to present the essence of the Christian faith in the light of his prior survey of history, science, philosophy and other aspects of man's endeavours

towards knowledge. For Barnes, Revelation is always offering itself to men, if they will but avail themselves of that divine gift of 'reason which is akin to the Universal Reason, the Logos of creation.' We describe ourselves as *Modern* Churchmen because we 'believe that, through the Holy Spirit, the revelation of Christ is a continuing process.' Barnes was clear on his responsibilities;

> 'when, by the progress of secular knowledge, opinions which have religious associations are shown to be false, it is a Bishop's duty so to combine old spiritual truths with the new knowledge that this knowledge is indeed "baptised into Christ".'

This is from the preface to *Should Such a Faith Offend?* in which we have the record of Barnes' many-sided activity. We may perhaps select for notice his basic Christocentric outlook.

> 'What place does Christ occupy in this scheme. We believe that, in Jesus, God was as completely manifested as was possible under human limitations. Our Lord was Very Man, with a truly human mind. But He was also Very God, showing His Deity in His humanly-perfect revelation of spiritual reality and in His complete loyalty to the Father's Will' (*op. cit.*, p. 34).

The progressive revelation of spiritual truth and the working of the Spirit of God through the divinely-guided evolution of humanity cannot be separated from the still living influence of Jesus, the Christ. In Him 'we have a revelation of God as complete and full as our nature allows us to receive' (*op. cit.*, p. 35). The Incarnation is the central fact of Christianity focused upon the doctrine of the Cross. 'The Cross has been, and remains, the great incentive to a divine recklessness which in our own time has sent a Schweitzer to the Congo and many a "pacifist" to prison' (*op. cit.*, p. 36). This is the theme of the bishop so recklessly charged by his critics with undermining the Christian faith.

> 'The centrality of Jesus implies that He gave a sufficient explanation of the spiritual reality to which man's moral and religious instincts are allied. . . . Jesus will ever more completely draw men and inspire them because they will the more fully understand that He explains them to themselves. In brief, human thought, as moulded by developed aspirations and accumulated knowledge, will not sweep past Jesus but will circle round Him as the centre where God revealed Himself' (*op. cit.*, pp. 55-6).

At death the normal man is only in process of being made and so remains in time; but the events after Jesus' death should be construed in realization that

> if a finished, perfected spirit were released from human limitations by death he would thereupon at once enjoy the fullness of eternal life' (*op. cit.*, footnote, p. 58).

Jesus came in the fulness of time and that judgment is not undermined by critical survey of cosmic history. For us it suffices that on earth 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.' The central theme is clear, but perhaps the critics were determined to protect fundamentalistic prejudices against the form of modern presentation which alone can win men to Christ in the twentieth century. Surely the day has passed when it should be an offence to say that 'The Incarnation means that in Jesus the Divine Life was lived under human conditions' (*op. cit.*, p. 152) and to insist that Jesus had a human mind (being truly man) with, consequently, human limitations?

But, equally, Barnes was emphatic on the Deity of Christ; in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily. 'The Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' is God's revelation of Himself to humanity and this same Christ-Spirit is active in all men of goodwill. The uniqueness of Jesus, however, was manifest in His unbroken consciousness of communion with God, and this is a note emphasized by Barnes. The following passage from that much-maligned work *The Rise of Christianity* shows Barnes' insight into the psychological basis of Jesus' sense of unique relationship to, and communion with, God.

> 'All our authorities are at one in testifying that the communion of Jesus with God was continuous and tranquil. There were no visions, no trances; there were no ecstatic occasions when the normal and wholesome working of his mind was violently disturbed. It would appear to be certain that the revelation of God which he received was never so sudden and exceptional as to produce physical disorder: it was never associated with marked mental agitation. God's presence with Jesus seems rather to have been a quiet and steady process, the abiding splendour in a character of rare beauty and purity (*op. cit.*, p. 142). (Note.—Reference is made to the significance of this assessment in Dr. H. G. Wood's article in the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1954.)

But if Jesus showed a unique relationship to God, equally He was at home with the world of Nature, revealing Himself as its interpreter in terms of spiritual value.

In addition to this brief reference to Barnes' Christology which has been so much misunderstood, we must deal with his Eucharistic teaching—the source of special offence, especially when couched in such terms as

> 'The root principle of idolatry is belief in a Deity localised in material objects through the invocation of a priest' (Preface, *Should Such a Faith Offend?*)

His thought was presented fair and square for judgment in his address to the Modern Churchmen's Conference in 1925, entitled 'The Eucharist.' After a careful survey of the historical origins

and background, he invokes the authority of the Protestant Reformers who faced up to the situation in the light of the scientific revolution and spirit, reborn at the Renaissance. As one would expect, he turns to the great Hooker as his natural predecessor in such matters: Hooker concluded that

> 'the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.'

Or more explicitly, 'the *soul of man* is the receptacle of Christ's presence.' Barnes likewise insists 'that the operation of the sacrament is a psychological process.' He quotes Hort, 'the greatest English theologian of the nineteenth century, whom some of us claim as the founder of English Modernism,' with a devastating challenge:

> 'The fictitious and constructive offering up of a phantom body and phantom blood is a degradation of the Holy Communion to the unreal mimicry of a sacrifice which, if real, would now be heathenish. It is the nemesis of destroying the relation between earthly elements and the heavenly life.'

To which Barnes added a quotation from Eckhardt, 'A man never gets to the underlying truth if he stops at the enjoyment of its symbol,' and another from Hort, 'Progress in theology does not consist in mutilation but in purification.' It was from this basis that he developed his much-misunderstood criticisms and his characteristically forthright challenge to observational (not chemical) test. It yet led him to a truly Christian conclusion: 'The Eucharist is the effectual symbol of an unity of humanity based on God as revealed in Christ. But it is representative of a still wider unity; a witness to the truth that all Christian life is sacramental, that the power of God is expressed and that His grace can be received through countless earthly vehicles. . . . Signs and vehicles of the Divine presence are all around us. To isolate our highest act of Communion is to neglect that truth that "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." Let us cling to St. Paul's extended sacramental faith: "All things work together for good to them that love God".'

And so we pass to the culmination of this man's challenge to established religion on the one hand, and society on the other. To the one he coupled with his Christological and sacramental controversies, the Modernist emphasis on such unnecessary dogmas as the Virgin Birth, the physical resurrection, and the Nature miracles. To society and the state he was equally challenging at all levels whether international, national or local. His pacifism was outspoken and fearless, but his work for social

reform was no less energetic, relentlessly exposing, in parallel with Dean Inge, the appalling problems which await humanity in its rash policy of progress through *laissez faire*. No wonder that he provoked hostility; no prophet has faced his inevitable stoning with such courage. Publicly 'sent to Coventry' by sections of his colleagues in the Church for which he dared so much, it would have been little wonder if his spirit had soured; but no, all (even his enemies) testified to his personal charm and his stature as a man and as a Christian. To the writer it falls to express a layman's conclusion: Barnes was a necessary event in the spiritual history of the twentieth century. Humanity has been steadily drifting away from its spiritual heritage; the official presentation was in full conflict with modern thought and, what is almost worse, with modern presentation in terms which could be generally understood; the inevitable reaction towards religious fundamentalism was in full swing, with the certain alienation of the informed laity; the world was heavy and torpid with the apathy engendered by violent outbursts of irrationality and world warfare; in short, humanity may be heading for spiritual disaster. A psychological 'shock' was essential and Barnes was one of the instruments of that treatment. All was in keeping with the rôle, and, however much one might have wished to see so great qualities displayed in circumstances permitting less precipitation of controversy and bitterness, he had a necessary task to perform, and he performed it well.

IN MEMORIAM

WILLIAM RALPH INGE, D.D., F.B.A., K.C.V.O.

(1860—1954)

ON February 26 in his ninety-fourth year William Ralph Inge passed away. In the history of the English Church during the first half of the twentieth century no English ecclesiastic was more widely known or more widely read by the English-speaking public. His readers ranged from University Professors down to the man in the street, from students of Plotinus down to adherents of the *Evening Standard*.

The son of an Oxford don, Provost of Worcester (who was offered an English bishopric by the early post and sent off his rejection of it before breakfast), W. R. Inge was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge. His academic career was amazingly brilliant. He once said : ' In examination lists I have always found my name where I wanted it to be.'

After a mastership at Eton he was elected a Fellow of his college in 1886 but in 1989 resigned it for a Fellowship of Hertford College, Oxford. This he held till 1904. At Hertford, Hastings Rashdall and Inge were contemporaries and as another Fellow of Hertford remarked : ' To hear those two Fellows arguing was an unforgettable experience.'

Inge's parents were Anglo Catholics; a portrait of his father hangs in Pusey House, Oxford, as one of its founders, and Inge wrote in his diary : ' My mother never really forgave me for not being an Anglo-Catholic ' (p. 34).

Undoubtedly Rashdall's influence at Hertford played a large part in converting Inge to ecclesiastical Liberalism, but an even more powerful liberating influence originated in his studies of Christian Mysticism. These studies bore fruit in his profoundly influential Bampton Lectures, *Christian Mysticism*, delivered in 1899. This volume secured an immediate and world-wide influence among readers of the English tongue.

When in 1901 as a New Zealand cleric I read a paper to my fellow-clergy on the knowledge of God as presented in the First Epistle of St. John one of my audience said : ' You have been reading Inge ' (he pronounced the name to rhyme with hinge, as I believe also did Bernard Shaw at that period), I could only confess that I had never heard of him.

In 1907 Inge returned to Cambridge as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Fellow of Jesus College. In 1911

Asquith, then Prime Minister, offered him the Deanery of St. Paul's. It is no secret that Davidson, then Primate, desired the appointment of a Canon of Canterbury although Inge had become a relation of the Archbishop by his marriage in 1905 with the daughter of Archdeacon Spooner of Maidstone. What his wife's gifts and graces did for Inge can only be described by her husband. She was a wonderful source of happiness and strength, but she failed to make him a favourite with the Primate. His gravity and deafness rendered him socially inaccessible.

From the very outset of his Deanery at St. Paul's Inge became a notable personality in our national life. The insight and incisiveness of his sermons, their fearlessness and frankness, made the Press eager to report him. He never flinched at the critical moment and the stern things he had to say in the dark days of the First World War demanded publicity. The Press nicknamed him the Gloomy Dean and the literary world ranked him with Dean Swift.

In addition to his preaching his literary activity was amazing. Book succeeded book and all of them of educational value. Some of them, like his *Philosophy of Plotinus* (two volumes, 1918) will survive as classics and others like *Outspoken Essays* (two vols., 1919 and 1922) will demand to be read by historians writing of the first quarter of the twentieth century.

As a Christian apologist addressing modern educated men he was unrivalled and not least because he was so readable. Unlike many Christian apologists he could be read with enjoyment, but he never sacrificed Christian truth to secure popularity. Neither a High Churchman nor a Low Churchman, he was unflinchingly loyal to the great Christian values which had to be bought with a price—incessant opposition to scepticism and superstition.

He is best described as a Christian Platonist, but of the English type. He was a Cambridge Platonist and his own University, not Athens, was his spiritual home. In fact he was intensely English as his essay on England testifies and was extraordinarily little influenced by modern Continental writers. His spiritual fatherland possessed three peaks: Plato's Athens, Tudor and Victorian England and Christ's, not Augustine's, Kingdom of God. But modern scientific research, biological and astronomical, psychological and eugenic, possessed his intense interest both in the field of essential knowledge and its enemy, vulgar and dangerous perversion. It was this practical devotion to truth, ancient and modern, which led him to value the Modern Churchmen's Union and he succeeded his 'old friend' Hastings Rashdall as President. Rashdall himself had succeeded Percy Gardner,

Professor of Classical Archaeology—and it would be hard to find a more remarkable trio wholeheartedly devoted to the Modern Churchmen's Union and yet each one of them an authority in a sphere pre-eminently his own.

Inge held his presidency for ten years and during all that period never missed its annual Conferences and his Presidential addresses, prepared with meticulous care, were published year by year in the *Modern Churchman*.

His latest volume, the *Diary of a Dean*, published in 1949 and reviewed in the *Modern Churchman* of March, 1950 (p. 47), emphasized his continued interest in our Cause. We cite the following characteristic utterances from it:

> *May* 7, 1922. 'I preached at St. Peter's in the East, under the auspices of the Modern Churchmen's Union. The church was not nearly large enough for the crowds who came to hear me. I emphasized the historical character of our religion and its foundation in the Person of Christ. I wished to dissociate myself from continental Modernists like Loisy, who think that the historical Jesus was only "a peasant of limited intelligence"' (p. 76).
>
> 'I had not very satisfactory talks with Herbert [Henson]. He is "unstable as water". He blames and dislikes the Modern Churchmen's Union. Like Lord Melbourne he says, "Why can't they let it alone?" Liberalism in theology will not get much more help from Herbert Dunelm' (p. 70).
>
> *February* 5, 1934. 'Dining with the Brotherhood I found that Herbert Henson was annoyed with me for approving of the invitation to a Unitarian to preach in Liverpool Cathedral. I have never read better sermons than those of J. H. Thom, a Unitarian divine, and Martineau's books are of great apologetic value. I have never found much to differ from in my talks with Jacks, though he goes too far, in my opinion, with Loisy about the historical Christ. Surely there are many subjects on which an Anglican congregation might profit by sitting under a devout and thoughtful Unitarian, or a Quaker. I am all in favour of trying to close schisms, if it can be done without sacrifice of principle. I think an earlier Henson would have agreed with me' (p. 177).

Referring to Lippmann's *Preface to Morals*:

> *January* 15, 1931. '. . . The main argument of Lippmann's book is that "disinterestedness" is the vital part of higher religion. Aldous Huxley has since said the same, calling it, less happily, non-attachment. When I was ordained deacon by the saintly Bishop King of Lincoln the only thing that the Bishop said to me was "Be disinterested; that is what really matters". Perhaps no wiser counsel could be given to a young man who might be suspected of being ambitious. I have always remembered it; though I have taken occasion to say, "Don't fancy yourself disinterested when you are only uninterested, and don't fancy yourself attracted by God when you are only repelled by man"' (p. 155).

A Liberal Churchman, indeed!

H.D.A.M.

LIBERALISM IS NOT DEAD

By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., F.B.A., K.C.V.O.

'LIBERALISM is dead,' said the editor of a Liberal journal to me last year. It is not dead, because ideas never die; they only go into hiding. Even children, said Juvenal, no longer believe in spirits and infernal regions. Three hundred years later the city mob was no longer shouting '*Panem et circenses*,' but '*Aron Areion*,' 'Take away Arius.' Personally I have lived through more than one name and more than one climate of opinion. Under Disraeli I called myself a Tory. While I was a Dean, Reginald McKenna called me the last Whig. Ten years hence shall I be remembered as the last Liberal? I think not. Revolutions devour their own children. In yes and no all things consist.

It happens that the collapse of political Liberalism has coincided with the rather unexpected set back of theological Liberalism. But I do not think the causes are the same. Political Liberalism almost committed suicide by allying itself with Democracy, with which it is incompatible. The Socialists and the new Conservatives are in the same game, government by mass bribery and the pillage of the unrepresented minority. Under Gladstone our purses and our consciences were in safe keeping and we called the Conservatives the stupid party. But in this paper I wish to consider only the condition and the prospects of Liberalism in theology. The buttresses of Victorian Liberalism have broken down. We have put on manacles to prevent our hands from shaking.

The lay religion of the last century had great influence upon theology, philosophy, and even natural science. It had one dogma: there is a cosmic law of progressive melioration leading to perfection. It was not clear whether this pleasant prospect belonged only to one species on one planet, or to the inhabitants of millions of other heavenly bodies, who, one would think, deserved redemption as much as we do. But in any case there was 'one increasing purpose' (whatever that absurd phrase means) and 'one far off divine event to which the whole creation moves.' The second law of thermo-dynamics, which the French call the principle of Carnot, had long before demolished this dogma, but it was not good manners to remember it; even for dogmatic materialists. That the world contains an infinity of finite purposes, each having beginning and end, which then have their place in the eternal order, is plain enough, but it needed two

wars to shatter the faith of the shallow optimists, who are left with a 'meaningless' (a favourite word with our recent prophets) world, and since science has let them down some of them have dug up prescientific beliefs, miracles and prophecies, and why not witchcraft, with precognition and levitation? Judaism became a spiritual religion about 500 B.C., when a new revelation shone forth almost simultaneously in China with Confucius, in India with Buddha, in Persia with Zoroaster, in Greece with the Orphics, and in Palestine with the later Jewish prophets. But much of the old Testament provides something cruder and therefore more acceptable. The religion of taboos, of bloody sacrifices, of Sabbaths and verbally inspired sacred books, has proved very tough. As for paganism, the Vatican, with its cunning knowledge of human nature, is not afraid of being out of date. An intelligent Indian said to me, 'I am thinking of joining the Roman Church; I want a goddess to worship.' He was shocked when I suggested Kali; the character of that lady made her impossible. But the Madonna is not a historical character; we know hardly anything about the mother of Jesus except that she had a large adult family of five sons and at least two daughters. It was not she who, as Catholics are now obliged to believe, flew up to heaven. 'Our Lady' is not the *Panagia Aphroditissa* of a church in Cyprus; she is Panagia Isis, wearing a new frock, but otherwise very much as she appeared to Apuleius. Do educated Catholics believe this? You can swallow anything as long as you do not chew it, and if you are a Catholic you are not allowed to chew. But we must not scorn our neighbour. There are anti-Liberal elements in continental Protestantism, where Karl Barth and Kierkegaard have had more influence than they have with us. Faith, they say, is a simple gift of God. It does not much matter why you believe, or what you believe, but be a *croyant* and you will be happy. Philosophy is at sixes and sevens; natural science is no longer sure of its own foundation; a mixture of positivism and pragmatism will be given to you, a new creed called existentialism, and if you are an existentialist you may be a Catholic like Marcel or an atheist like Sartre.

Tout vient à point qui sait attendre. This is what we used to believe. Time is the friend. There is a tilt in the right direction; Ormuzd will have the best of it, if we give him time. We can hardly believe that now, since 1939. Does that mean that we must agree with Horace:

Damnosa quid non imminuit dies?
Aetas parentum peior avis tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitiosiorem?

No; time is neither the enemy nor the friend. Time and Space are only the warp and woof of the canvas on which we draw our impressions of things and events; for themselves they have no qualities. But the loss of faith in a law of progress has taken the heart out of Liberalism. It could accept the dwindling of faith in God; it quailed at the loss of faith in man. Liberalism, as Macneile Dixon says, wished to eliminate the devil. In its hierarchy of values there were no minus signs. Evil was right in the wrong place; it only needed reshuffling. The devil shammed dead in the reign of Victoria; he has now come out roaring. The New Testament should have taught us better, 'the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me.'

Another blow to our confidence is connected with history. The Deity, as we know, cannot alter the past. It takes a historian to do this. Unfortunately it is falsified history that guides us from one quagmire to another. The past which never happened points to the future which never will be. Liberal Protestantism tries to demythologize religion, but its hero-worship was not always intelligent. Loisy was able to show that Harnack's picture of Christ was a modernised portrait. Harnack and Seeley present us with a German or English gentleman; Schweitzer and others, remembering when and where He lived, make Him more like a Mahdi. Going back to their sources, Jewish converts loaded Him with the highest honours they knew. They called Him the Messiah, the last thing, in my opinion, that He wished to be taken for, since the Messiah was a fanatically patriotic dream, which ended by turning Jerusalem into Aelia Capitolina. The Greek converts honoured Him as the saviour-God of their mysteries, which again was very far from 'the prophet of Nazareth in Galilee.' As for His preaching, have we got what He actually said, or the Gospel as it was accepted by the little flock who hung their best thoughts upon Him? How much easier to accept tradition, the autobiography of a society which, if it was to live, had to live as it did! If we want to know a man, said Loisy, we do not try to put him back into his cradle. It is much easier to swallow whatever food is set before us when an authoritative Church offers the objective treasures of grace and redemption, to be taken as they are or rejected; and this is the only type of religion which can 'win the masses,' because it lays no stress on the need for personal holiness, and makes no demand on the critical faculty. But it is very far from the original Gospel, which was a free personal piety with an impulse to communion with kindred spirits, but without any tendency to the creation of an organized cult. Liberalism, which believes in freedom, has no sympathy with static formulas; a

creed which never changes when all else is changing is ultimately doomed, though it stands firm against such changing winds of doctrine as now blow past us every few years. Jesus-worship is in part a modern phrase; it is different from the faith of St. Paul, which is almost indifferent to 'Christ after the flesh': the apostle vitally convinced of communion with the glorified and indwelling Christ, whom he practically identifies with the Holy Spirit of God. 'The Lord is the Spirit.' This is a matter of experience, and in reality almost independent of history; for even the identification of the indwelling Spirit with the historical Jesus is not capable of proof, though no Christian could bear to doubt it. When we remember that the presence of the Holy Spirit within us is inseparable from the 'transformation' of the human soul into His likeness, we can understand how the Eastern Church, nourished by Plato and Origen more than by Aristotle and Augustine, has emphasized *theosis* more than Western Catholicism has done. Refugee Russian theology may be studied with advantage.

The pessimism which is undoubtedly spreading in ecclesiastical circles is partly based on the spectacle of half empty churches. This discouragement is part of our ingrained democratism. If there ever was a movement which disdained the counting of heads, it was the original Gospel of Christ. But are there contributory causes? I think there are.

The Church has made some inevitable mistakes. Perhaps the worst was the adoption of the Hebrew scriptures, including those which are dated long before the above mentioned enlightenment about 500 B.C. Our Anglican services are clogged with Judaism. Then there is bigoted exclusiveness. The dominant party in our Church tends to divide all other Christians into those who unchurch them and those whom they unchurch. A third error is the perfectibility dream which I have already mentioned. A fourth is the notion that 'supernatural' events which happened once long ago can permanently affect the relation of God to the human race. History deals only with Time, and Time is not ultimately real. Barbaric Conservatism is as obstinate as traditionalism.

George Tyrrell, who had the temperament of an Irishman and a martyr, once said that the time may come when there will be nothing left of Christianity except mysticism and the law of love. That was a very rash thing for a priest to say—that is our first impression. And then we remember who it was who said, 'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' After all this is the essential Gospel, if by mysticism we mean the Christ-mysticism of St. Paul, the first and greatest of Christian mystics. If we collect the passages in which St. Paul speaks of the

Holy Spirit and add to our list the famous thirteenth chapter of *I Corinthians*, there is not much that we should wish to add, except that God reveals Himself not only as perfect Love but as perfect Truth and perfect Beauty. And this, I think, may console the despondent Liberal. As Troeltsch says, as soon as the Gospel of Christ became the Gospel about Christ, the three types of belief, the Church, the Sects and Mysticism, appeared. These have always coexisted, and mysticism is the religion of the educated. The educated are a small minority, no doubt; but they are not all penned into one fold. St. Paul, a Liberal churchman if ever there was one, says that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free. St. Augustine, more surprisingly, says that Christianity is as old as creation; there never was a time when it did not exist. It is only since the Incarnation that it has acquired its present name of Christianity. The medieval theologian would have howled if he had been told that he had anything in common with 'Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics.' Have we not got an Act *de haeretico comburendo*? But if we read the writings of the mystics, we get a very different impression. Do not let us listen to the nonsense that the testimony of the mystics is purely subjective and not transferable. If a dozen honest men (not to speak of one kitten) tell me that they have climbed the Matterhorn, I am satisfied that the summit of that mountain is accessible, though I shall never get there myself; and the testimony of the Saints is just as objective and trustworthy as that which is furnished by the visible world as we know it. And what do the mystics tell us about the Will of the Lord, when after long training and discipline they have climbed it? Trust them. Trust Chinese, Hindus, Persians, Mohammedans, Greeks, Hellenists, Catholics, Protestants, Jews. They have all seen the same and they have all had the same experience. Even physical accompaniments, like the sudden flash of light, it is all there, from Plato to the English Puritan. Tennyson makes his Ancient Sage say that nothing worth proving can be proven nor yet disproven. But the vision of God can be proven, if anything on earth can be proven; it is a direct experience, and though moments of ecstasy are brief and rare, those who have enjoyed them never think that they have only been dreaming. Have they been in contact with 'the One beyond existence'? So Plotinus thought, and this is more than we can say. 'To ascend above *Nous* is to fall outside it,' are his own words; but this much they say that they *knew*, that God has spoken to them. I think we may say that this experience is above high water mark. It cannot be discredited by natural science, or history, or philosophy, nor is it peculiar to any time

or place or creed. It has behind it three thousand years of first-hand evidence, and is thus immune to the attacks upon rationalism which have threatened to become attacks upon reason itself. Liberalism seeks in vain to destroy itself by undermining the foundations on which it rests, our confidence in the verdict of the mind at its highest stretch. 'I will sing and give praise with the best member that I have,' and this member is the spirit of wisdom and understanding in which the human reason is caught up into something higher than itself.

Isolation, the deadliest foe of the spiritual life, is especially deadly when it estranges us from our brethren whom a false loyalty treats as our foes. 'Faith unfaithful makes us falsely true.' I see nothing but good in the interest which we are beginning to take in Asiatic thought. We despised the coloured races because they could not resist us in war. We have now reluctantly acknowledged their right to independence and we are beginning to see that they are our intellectual equals. We have much to teach them, and they to teach us. A new freedom is ours, such as was not strange to St. Augustine, or to St. Justin Martyr, who says that the Logos inspired Socrates. Nearer to us than India there is the Eastern Church: Berdyaeff and Frank should be honoured by us, for our country has always known its friend in 'our old loving nurse the Platonic philosophy.' Is it not a sign of freedom that everywhere alike the best books on religion are written by laymen? Even now they are more free from constraint than professional teachers of divinity.

'Honour all men, Love the brotherhood, Fear God, Honour the King. That is to say, we belong to several corporations, each of which has an indefeasible but limited claim upon us. To make the claim of any one of them (we may exempt 'fear God') absolute is to destroy freedom and to deny the rights of the others. If we begin by believing absurdities we shall end by committing atrocities. The last twenty years have shown this plainly enough. Religious fanaticism, unlimited competition, and war, are the murderers of freedom. We know now that they end in suicide, though they win victories. They may drive Liberalism underground; they have done so before now. But we know our danger, as we did not know it in the last century. It is not too late to 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.' The alternative may be the atom bomb.

MEDICAL AND CLERICAL CO-OPERATION

By H. F. Green, M.A., M.B., D.P.H.

I QUALIFIED twenty-two years ago and have since then had constant contact with persons in trouble, first as a general practitioner and then in the public health service. In restrospect the influence of the priest of whatever denomination seems to have waned, so that he no longer has the authority necessary for the guidance of his people nor is he their natural adviser. The national yearly drug bill is in part an expression of the loss of status of the churches. Most people find it exceedingly difficult to distinguish between spiritual and physical values, and unless they are trained to think or are exceptionally gifted they tend to substitute physical for spiritual values. This natural phenomenon of thought was not reconcilable with the dogma of nineteenth-century science, and forced the separation of matters spiritual from a solid rational and mechanistic view of everyday life. Faced with this dilemma which was not then resolvable by most of us, church dogma lost much of its authority with the laity and so the Church lost some of its power to help the people.

In the past twenty years or so a number of diseases have been described as psychosomatic, for the very good reason that they have their origins in the state of the mind as well as in the state of the body. Ulcerative colitis seems to affect a certain type of person, certain forms of eczema affect other types and so on. A few dramatic cures of eczema have been claimed by psychiatrists. The influence of mind over the human body is now accepted, and indeed the mechanism by which the mind can cause physical change to take place in the body is now beginning to be understood. Thus the conditions are now ripe for a continuity of thought and action between the medical and clerical professions.

When a person falls sick the whole family is affected more or less. On most occasions the members can deal with the situation without any outside help other than perhaps that of the family doctor. Although this is true of the simple infections and mechanical injuries to which man is subject, it does not apply to the major ills of serious infection, degenerative disease, or least of all psychosomatic disorder. Degenerative disease tends to be progressive and often predictable in its course. Even though the treatment of the degenerative processes may safely be left with the physicians, there are many other problems for the families to solve which take up too much time and require perhaps too wide a knowledge of their members for the physicans to tackle unaided.

Apart from the spiritual approach to these things, a large number of severely practical problems may have to be tackled—problems of housing, of domestic help, of failing faculties and of failing income. Foresight and the courage to use it may make all the difference to the whole family, but so often the family has not quite the courage to face the situation.

Psychosomatic disorders so far have rarely proved amenable to treatment by psychological means alone. As their name suggests, a combination of physical and psychological treatment is required. Many of these disorders have their beginnings very far back in childhood and the attendant circumstances are only just discernible to a trained mind. They could probably be modified in many cases at the time of their occurrence. Usually there is no skilled observer present, and so they can only be deduced later on by relying upon the memory of patients and their parents. By then the emotional factors are fixed. The neuroses and psychoneuroses and the anxieties and strains of everyday life are commonly transferred to physical symptoms such as headaches, indigestion, rheumatism, and so on. It is in these groups of ailment that the family doctor is working under such adverse conditions. Once the essential prerequisites of examination and diagnosis have been made and properly communicated to those concerned, there is little more that he can do in the time available. The full assessment of attendant circumstance so often lies outside his competence that further help must be obtained.

True mental disease or disability is quite characteristic to those trained to recognize it, and can be distinguished from the character of the sufferer. For instance, a feeble-minded child may be naturally nice or nasty even though his behaviour is almost animal-like. Those families in which there is mental illness or deficiency are in need of constant help of a sort that is only now beginning to be available.

The organisation of the Welfare and Health Services is so complex that many people require advice on procedure in order to obtain help from it. At present this is obtained through hospital almoners (who rarely enter homes) for hospital patients, and through the County Health Officers and National Assistance Officers for certain other cases. The less literate are often seriously handicapped. Rarely do these visiting officers get the chance of knowing the whole family well enough to give the best possible advice.

I hope that I have now made out a case to show that there is a need for one man who knows the whole of the family circumstances before, during and after the event, who can act as the

skilled guide and adviser. He must have considerable knowledge of both normal and abnormal psychology and of mental deficiency; he must be well acquainted with the organization of the Welfare Services and the National Health Services; not only must he know what charitable benefits are available and suitable for each case, but he must be able to co-ordinate the activities of all the agencies concerned. (On one occasion I remember the following officials being concerned over one case in which the family was evicted for non-payment of rent: the Sanitary Inspector, the Inspector of the N.S.P.C.C., the Children's Officer, the Welfare Officer, the District Highways Surveyor, the District Nurse, the Mental Health Officer, the Medical Officer of Health and the family doctor!). He should know that family and their environment individually well enough to be able to see the beginnings of trouble, and when it has come to pass to be able to co-ordinate and advise in the interests of the family as a whole without the handicap of emotional entanglement with them. It is obvious that much of this work must, under existing circumstances, be outside the spiritual aspects of a priest's duty. It entails such work as acting as almoner in cases outside hospital—perhaps even in hospital, arranging for the care of children and old people and making use of various charitable organizations. Such a person must be prepared to have cases referred to him by the various members of National Health and Welfare Services for executive action. He would therefore need a great deal of knowledge of psychology, normal and abnormal. It is most important to be able to recognise and understand mental disease and mental deficiency. He would need a lot of social science—in fact knowledge normally the stock in trade of the almoner, the probation officer and the children's officer. Such clerics are very rare, and where they are to be found their services are in constant demand. Much of this work, particularly individual case work, was supposed to be within the duties of the family doctor. It has proved impossible for him to fulfil these duties, and it does not appear likely for a variety of reasons that he will be able to do so in the future. This gap in our social services is probably responsible for a colossal waste of time and money. People in need of advice and reassurance seek a busy doctor, pour out a long story of physical symptoms and receive a bottle or many bottles of medicine. Administrative officers maintain large and expensive departments to gather information and supervise those who are a charge on the State.

I suggest that this gap should normally be filled by the parish priest or resident minister. If the work were properly carried out

it should save a vast amount of time and money, should save a lot of cumbrous administration, and should reduce the size of the doctor's surgery giving him time to carry out his proper functions, early diagnosis, considered prognosis and specific treatment. If these duties and responsibilities could be recognized as coming within the ambit of a cleric's work, he would have occasion to make contact with his congregation on a mundane level. Since the human mind does not naturally distinguish spiritual from mundane affairs the addition of these onerous duties would help him in the work for which he was ordained, and would help to extend the beneficial service of the Church in the sphere of every-day life.

Such work could not be undertaken without training, and therefore I suggest that courses of instruction should be arranged on a strictly non-demoninational basis. Instruction should be followed by examination and the issue of a qualifying diploma. Priests qualified to carry out this work should have their names enrolled in their own district, so that they may be known to those requiring their services. Thus the local doctors, the hospitals, the County Councils and other Welfare Authorities, would know to whom they could apply for information or help. By undertaking this work the clergy would be brought much closer to the people and to their problems.

HALF A CENTURY OF GERMAN THEOLOGICAL LIBERALISM

By Rennie Smith, B.Sc., M.P. 1924-1931
Author of *General Disarmament or War, Peace Verboten,* etc.

THE peoples and governments of the Old World and the New go about their daily business on the assumption that 1945 really does mark an outstanding date in the history of the Germans. This is true for German theology, too. It underwent as well its retreat from Moscow, and a Europe, overrun by Germans, came to its present unstable equilibrium in the bomb-proof shelters of the cities of the Fatherland. No doubt, since 1945 much that is new, and which will surprise the world, is growing up in Germany; new theology, too. This article is concerned with the liberal theology which ended in the second world war, and for which it had its share of responsibility. A book[1] has just been published, dealing with the life and work of Martin Rade who was, with his publication the *Christliche Welt*, the central personality of German Liberal theology for nearly fifty years. The book, because of the rich sources of gathered material it contains, has won the deserved praise of people so far apart as Bishop Dibelius of Berlin and Karl Barth of Basle. It is a book that will come into increasing use as Germany's recent theological past becomes an object of study again. A few words, first, about Martin Rade himself, before I try to outline the liberal theological writing, of which he was so much the centre, over the period of his lifetime.

Martin Rade died in 1940, at the age of eighty-three. Throughout his life he possessed an inexhaustible energy. He had a great talent for friendship. All kinds of people came to him and were at home with him. He was able throughout his long life to hold together men of the most diverse theological views. He himself, chiefly under the influence of Adolf von Harnack, early developed liberal views and moved steadily in a liberal direction. He was the founder and editor of the *Christliche Welt* which reviewed over its long existence, until it ended in the second world war, every German theological work of importance. In addition, the paper took an active interest in many Protestant ventures and in the major problems which a politically united Germany undergoing rapid industrialisation, brought to the fore.

[1] Johannes Rathje: *Die Welt des Freien Protestantismus,* 32.60 DM. Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag, Stuttgart.

Martin Rade was educated in theology mainly at Leipzig University where he came under the influence of two men who did so much to shape his future life : one was Professor Hildebrand, whose lectures on Goethe crystalised into the classical biography which bears his name; the other was von Harnack, who was then a *Dozent* at Leipzig, busy with the lectures which were later to make his famous *History of Dogma.* Von Harnack formed a 'Theological Wednesday Society' for his students, where influences were released to affect deeply the lives of all the participants. German idealism of the Goethe period; liberalism as expounded by von Harnack—these were the two formative influences in the life of the young Rade.

In 1882 he commenced his preaching work in a rural parish in Schoenbach, where weavers and peasants were for nine years his congregation. Then he transferred to the city life of Frankfurt-a-Main and came into intimate contact with the new proletariat of German capitalist industry and the socialist aspirations of workers who, in the main, had already left the churches. But no Church could contain his energies and interests. He was far too deeply involved in the theological struggles of his age to do other than share in them. Strauss' *Life of Jesus* was a generation old. The two great schools, the Erlanger one of orthodoxy and the critical-historical liberal school of Tuebingen, were at the height of their dialectical conflicts. Large numbers of ministers and theologians sought a Middle of the Way outlook. It was amid these stirring influences that Rade, along with three of his friends of the Harnack 'Wednesday Society,' launched his *Christliche Welt.*

II

By the end of the century, Rade was a *Dozent* at Marburg and soon to become a Professor of Theology at that University. He, too, inaugurated 'open evenings' for his students and friends, in his own home. They can hardly be over-estimated in their creative influence on the religious life of Germany. They brought together the 'Friends' of the *Christliche Welt*, which was fourteen years old when the century ended. The original intention of Rade and his friends was far from 'liberal.' Indeed, conservative would better describe the aim :

> 'To restore pure Lutheranism to replace the base counterfeit in circulation.'

The paper sought not to create another party within the Church, but rather to serve the educated among the people as a whole.

The way to a joyful and living Christ was 'the understanding of the Lutheran Reformation.' In the first issue of 1886, the editor had stated :

> 'We write for the educated in our congregations, not for theologians. We want to be both educated and Christian.'

Rade's thesis was that if the educated did not become Christian, there would soon be no longer a Christian people. But the work of Harnack made straw of those good conservative intentions. When his *History of Dogma* was published, and later (1898) *Das Wesen des Christentiums* (The Meaning of Christianity), how could Rade sit on the fence? He took sides. *Christliche Welt* became a liberal protagonist against the powerful orthodoxy of the Churches. Similarly when Friedrich Naumann developed his *Inner Mission* in an attempt to express the social implications of the gospel, Rade's paper became a platform of encouragement for 'social gospel' ideas. On the other hand, Arthur Bonus was publishing his *Deutsche Glaube* (German Faith), an anti-Jewish forerunner of a library of 'German' religions destined to become a powerful support of the Hitlerism of a later generation.

Martin Rade made it his policy to keep the doors of the paper wide open, while moving in a liberal direction. The religious-historical school, led by von Harnack, Wellhausen and Duhm, found an increasingly sympathetic place in the paper; the search for the historical person of Jesus expanded; the writings of Bossuet and Troeltsch came to the fore. The Bossuet-Wrede-Troeltsch attack against Ritschl loomed large; the *Christcliche Welt* became, so to say, a Harnack paper during the first decade of this century when the attack of orthodoxy raged so furiously against him. Rade wrote of Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums* that it was a book round which the bewildered minds of the time time should be gathered, and that it stood for an epoch.

A 'Union of Friends of the Christian World' was founded in 1909 and soon had a membership of 900. Its four-point programme shows how much the *Christliche Welt* had departed from its original intentions and had become, in fact, a rallying ground of Christian liberalism.

> 1. 'We represent the unqualified freedom of theological science and the right of public discussion of its results as an unqualified condition for a sound development of evangelical piety among our people.
>
> 2. We demand liberty in the shaping of conviction for future evangelical preachers and teachers and the protection of those in office against narrow conceptions of teaching and arbitrary intervention in civic rights as the foundation of the indispensable confidence of its reality in the congregations.

3. While recognising the necessity of an external Church order, we oppose efforts to reduce it to uniform, stereotyped rules, since a variety of forms can only promote a richer unfolding of life.

4. We regard it as an urgent duty to meet in an honest way the awakening needs in wide circles for enlightenment and deepening of religious knowledge, because only in this way can the turning away of great masses from evangelical Christianity be prevented.'

These theological struggles took place in an environment where the German Marxist Trade Union movement was growing by leaps and bounds, where the Marxist Social Democratic Party under a reactionary franchise had achieved a phenomenal success in the Reichstag elections, and where a great workers' strike (1905) had occurred in the Ruhr, and when the new German Navy was in process of rapid construction. Inevitably the 'international' aspect of Christianity assumed pressing importance: in 1908 a group of German personalities, of whom Rade was one, came to Britain on a mission of reconciliation, in the strained situation. Next year prominent British churchmen, among whom was Canon Glazebrook, Chairman of the Council, paid a return visit to Germany; von Harnack received them, and the Dean of Westminster lectured at the University of Berlin. In 1909 Rade visited America to take part in a World Congress for Free Christanity and Religious Progress. Three years later, not least due to the untiring work of Rade, the same Congress was held in Berlin and became, under von Harnack's leadership, a demonstration of what German Liberal Theology had to offer to the world.

Rade worked hard to waken the lethargic orthodox Church to interest in the 'peace' question. He found a platform for Professor Walter Schuecking, who was later to hold the only Chair of International Relations ever created in a German university. There were more friendship efforts of the liberal-minded of the British and German Churches in 1911-12.

III

With few exceptions, German theologians and pastors (von Harnack at the head: it was he who drafted the Kaiser's Balcony war speech at the end of July, 1914) regarded the war as a 'just' war and went enthusiastically into its service. Just or not, 'the Christian's unquestioned duty was loyalty to his own State in time of war.' Rade wanted the *Christliche Welt* and its Friends to look ahead and do constructive thinking.

'Through this war much must be changed, made to change. Beyond the war aims of the war-waging nations—what will then be must be the chief concern of our Christian circle. This we owe to the soul of our German people.'

But the main drift was towards silence till after the war; and opinion, of course, was profoundly changed by 1918. In that year Rade published a sermon by Dean Inge, delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral at a gathering of the British Group of the world Council of Churches.

> 'We all, we peoples, when perhaps not all in the same degree, have yielded to the third temptation of the Devil: "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me"—if you will use my weapons: power and lies. Now we have seen that power is not part of the essential Being of God, as Christ said: "Those who take the sword shall perish by the sword." It is my firm belief that the world after these terrible experiences will accept this teaching . . . I believe we shall never do anything like this again, neither in our life-time, nor that of our children.'

IV

The in-between years (1919-39) provided a setting for German liberal theology, in the shape of defeat, political revolution, and starvation of the German people. Karl Barth's *Romans* was first published in 1919; his Dialectical Theology attained a great vogue among a people in despair. A daughter of Rade married a brother of Karl Barth, the latter being once a Friend of the *Christliche Welt*. Rudolf Otto's *Das Heilige* was followed by his appeal for an oecumenical World Church. Edward Grubb, a Quaker, and the Dean of Worcester attended a gathering of the *Christliche Welt* in Eisenach in 1919; they expressed an aspect of British Liberalism. Professor Friedrich Heiler, a leader of the *Una Sancta Movement*, was doing a similar work among Swedish students and became a devoted friend of Archbishop Soederblom who was to take the initiative which led to the Stockholm Conference of 1925. Inflation was added to the miseries of post-war Germany. Rudolf Steiner stole some Liberals, including Rittelmeyer, for his Anthroposophy. Professor Bultmann, in this bewildering confusion, complained that *Christliche Welt* was becoming too little theological; he was soon criticising the second edition of Barth's *Romans*.

A new movement was added (1933): *Verband der Freien Protestanten* (Union of Free Protestants). The Christian attitude to war showed three schools in the *Christliche Welt*. Social Gospel came to the fore again, Rade published three volumes: *Von Gott* (1924), *Von Christus* (1926) *Vom Geist* (1927); the first was dedicated to von Harnack. Rade's seventieth birthday in 1926 was celebrated by the production of a volume of *Forty Years of the Christliche Welt* to which there were ninety-eight contributors

and which thus became a living and critical survey of that period of the paper and the immense and variegated theological life which those tumultuous years expressed. It was von Harnack again who headed the list of distinguished writers in honour of Rade's great work.

V

The Hitler racial-religious and military movement was on the way. Rade's talent for holding his Friends together was put to another severe test. He did not take any active part in the rival Confessional Evangelical Church movement and went more than half way to meet the 'German' Christian tendencies. But he rejected the excessive Germanism and anti-Christianism of the Ludendorff group and reviewed *Mein Kampf* critically in 1932. Of the religious aspect of Nazism he could write :

> 'When I go lecturing again I will keep in mind that Blood has a quality all its own, and hold on to Race, although it has become a most uncertain thing. But the fact will remain that a man who makes his own blood the supreme source of revelation puts himself outside the pale of Christianity. Let us say, they know not what they do.'

Soon after Hitler's accession to power, Rade was dismissed from the service of the State. It was a hard blow and involved, too, loss of pension rights; but Friends came generously to his help, and later the proceeds of the sale of the residential centre of *Christliche Welt* was used to put him into a position of comfort. The Union of Friends was also dissolved, but the paper was still allowed to continue. Although the editorship had passed over to Dr. Mulert, Rade was still active and looked forward to a time when the *Christliche Welt* could play a formative part again. In effect, from 1933 till the end of the second war, a dark curtain overhung the theological and Church life of Germany. It has to be admitted that it was precisely the liberal-minded pastors and laity who were most disposed to see in the renaissance and reunion of Germany under Hitler a special act of Providence to which appropriate attention must be paid. In these circles a theological language was not uncommon which referred to the Fuehrer as 'greater than Martin Luther.' Karl Barth was sent home. Religious-Christian Socialists, like Paul Tillich, found their way to America. The fiftieth anniversary of the *Christliche Welt* fell in 1936. Rade then proposed as themes for discussion :

1. 'What can we learn from the Confessional Church?'
2. 'What can we learn from the German Faith Movement?'
3. 'What can we learn from the Dialectical Theology?'

VI

The *Christliche Welt* survived into the Second World war and until 1941. The last issue contained these words:

> 'The industrial war needs demand the strongest concentration of all forces. This makes it necessary to suspend our paper until further notice, in order to liberate men and material for other important war purposes. We take, we hope, only a provisional farewell from our readers, and from the numerous Friends at home and abroad, whom the *Christliche Welt,* the life-work of Martin Rade, has been able to serve.'

The author of the book, Dr. Rathje, at this point makes the following comment:

> 'Hitler, Goebbels and Rosenberg have accomplished their aim: step by step (since 1933) they have realised their purpose. Now, under the deceptive plea of war necessities, the most outstanding paper of German Protestantism has vanished. Rade did not live to the end. God in his mercy took him a year ago to himself . . . Is this the end? No, certainly not. The day will come when the *Christliche Welt* in changed times and form will again appear. The great tradition and achievement will not then be forgotten.'

Rade died just before his paper came to an end. Of the many encomiums given to Rade I select one:

> 'With him an epoch comes to an end. He was a fearless and upright Protestant, who perhaps went sometimes too quickly to the help of threatened men and causes; yet he was one of the most positive minds in the whole circle . . . He ever built a road towards freedom . . . Yet in his inner being he was for the Church, churchly. The secret of his strong influence goes back to his polarity. He was not mere liberalism alone . . . . . With him we had the feeling: here is a pious heart . . . Through all his scientific activity there was a breath in him of what we call Eternity . . . To him it was given to bind and not to loose . . . He created perhaps a new theology, but he also made piety again honourable.'

The post-war movement *Freies Christentum* (1945) is endeavouring to continue the liberal tradition of the *Christliche Welt*, the life-work of Rade and his 'Friends.' It possesses a monthly paper, and is producing a series of pamphlets for the new post-war period. It is a good omen that Georg Wuensch, Professor of Theology, formerly a Pastor and an active Friend of the *Christliche Welt* in past years, is now President of the new *Freies Christentum.* The new liberal theology in the Germany of to-day has much to do.

THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION AND THE CHURCH

By the Rev. H. W. Newell, M.A., B.D., Vicar of Lyminster

CAN we expect that Christianity and science will be able to live in friendly accord in our time? It looks as though a much more radical rift is developing between the thought-world of the Christian and that of the modern scientist than our optimists would have us believe.

It is not only that the new thinking goes on in a more and more specialized language and *milieu*. It is that Christianity is coming to be regarded, not so much as hostile, as irrelevant. It is thought of as an inseparable part of the outmoded social and intellectual order. Respect is still given to the Church. But it receives it for its achievements in the past; just as royalty is worth preserving, at least for the present, for its symbolical value, and for its links with the centuries. But neither come into the mind when men are thinking of the new world that is opening up.

This new era is more radically a break with the past than other intellectual revolutions have been. No one knows what this new world will be like; but the board is set for a new game altogether. To use a word of Bonhoeffer's, the man of the new world feels that he is at last an *adult*. And he thinks this, not boastfully, but as a plain fact. It is not only that he knows more about the universe than his predecessors; but he now has for the first time adequate tools to proceed further in the conquering and exploiting of man's environment.

And Christianity is, to his mind, quite irrelevant to all this.

This sort of charge would matter but little to the Christian if it were all. He is used to being ignored by clever folk. But the new adult goes further than to dismiss Christianity as irrelevant. He is doubtful whether it can give him and his world the kind of wisdom that is needed as he goes forward into the unknown future.

He has often been told, for example, that the rise of Nazism is a pointer to the dangers that beset modern Europe when it discards Christianity. But he doubts whether that is the true moral of that terrible episode in Europe's history. Communism seems to take a more whole-hearted opposition to both nationalism and to race-feeling than Christianity does, with its deep involvement in the *status quo*.

With these questionings about the ethical backbone of Christianity in the new order, he turns with a certain hardening

of the heart to examine again the theory of this religion. Its scriptures and its creeds seem to require such a mountain of 'explanations' before they can be understood that his scepticism is reinforced. And he is amused by its insistence that it alone has the truth, and that every other religion is to be rejected, however it may be loved by its adherents. And these claims seem to be negatived by the quarrels and bitterness between the different branches of Christianity itself.

He is aware of a twist of dislike, as he prepares himself to go deeper into the Faith than first appearances encourage him to do. Few of the interpreters of Christianity seem to him to go nearly far enough into first principles. They forget that he has already queried many of the concepts that they take for granted. What, for example, does the word 'God' mean? There are better words for the wholeness of things, or for *élan vital*, if that is what is meant. Or 'faith'? He uses that word, if at all, for the working hypothesis of successive methods of investigation, to be given up as soon as may be, and replaced by something more advanced. And so many of the words that the Christian sets store by—sin, redemption, mercy, and so forth—seem to be negative concepts. What have they to do with this beckoning new world of adventure and achievement? He supposes that theology will have to be re-written, just as his own text-books have had to be re-written. Meantime he is impatient to strip the jargon of the theologian of its *aura*. It stands in the way of clear thinking. And he suspects that when this is done there won't be much left. Even in the case of the figure of Christ, when the *aura* has been removed, there is indeed left a worthy Person, well worth remembering historically. But why so much mystery?

He turns with relief from all this to the matters that are clamant for his attention. There is much to be done here before the task of thinking out a theology becomes important. Man now has a mathematics, a physics and a chemistry that equip him to go on to undreamed of worlds. The future is exciting. Let us leave behind superstitions and even doubtful fancies, that belong to the days before these discoveries. Let us leave behind too the clinging faults that go with the time of darkness. Let us be adult indeed; and learn to live at last. Who knows? Perhaps contemporary communism may outgrow its faults, and develop into the way of living together that the world needs. But Christianity seems musty and remote.

. . . . . .

What is the Christian to say to this modern mood? Protestations of unfairness or one-sidedness are of little use. Is the

history of the Renaissance to be repeated? Are we to look for some new kind of Reformation, by which a splinter party from traditional Christianity will make terms with the new outlook, to be followed by a new Counter-reformation in the continuing Church, and ultimately by a new ecumenical movement, leading once more to a unity? Or is the break with the past too radical?

There seems to be emerging one point of contact between the faith of the Church and the more earnest among the scientists. That is the doctrine of the Body of Christ, the Beloved Community, united with its Head, and with one another. We are witnessing the profound influence of this doctrine on the separated Church itself in our time. It seems to have a deep appeal also to the humanist who is looking for light in his own perplexities.

For whatever else results from the new scientific outlook, it fails to effect any philosophy of community. The only bond of union that it offers to man is a common aspiration for a better standard of life; the only appeal to idealism is to aspire that others may share in the better conditions that you anticipate for yourself. This leaves great areas of human emotion and aspiration outside. It requires that authority should apply compulsive and repressive action if men are to be kept subservient to it.

The scientist recognises, in many cases, this serious lack in his philosophy. In medical science, for example, we are within sight of the wonderful consummation of vast labour in this field, in that nearly all the diseases of the individual are now under control or at least understood. The problem now lies within the sphere of social medicine. The practitioner finds himself faced by a vast amount of psychic disease, which needs to be treated by dealing with the patient as part of a healthy community. But, as T. S. Eliot has seen, modern man is appallingly lonely. It is no wonder that many a modern humanist finds himself listening again to words that he thought he had left behind—'I believe in the holy, catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins.'

Similarly, the comparative study of religion is now thought of as a branch primarily of sociological study. The student is aware that the expression that a religion takes in social behaviour, in cult and in ritual habit, is ultimately more significant for his study than the intellectual convictions that many of its adherents may consider more important. And so the student of modern comparative religion comes to look with new sympathy at the Christian worshipper who is kneeling at the altar. And as a sociologist he understands, as never before, that he cannot truly appreciate what he is studying until he abandons any attitude of cynicism or

contemptuous scepticism. He must enter into the experience from within so far as that is possible for him, and he must see it as a living and growing thing.

All this is travelling on the same road as the Christian's 'people for God's own possession.' It may be that it provides a sympathetic point of contact with the whole cycle of Christian aspiration and experience.

From this same luminous point, the Church is repenting of her past bondage to pride and particularity, and is once again opening her heart to the creative forces of the Spirit. A repentant, humble and united Christian Church alone has a prophetic word to a world that is seeking for cohesion and unity.

THE ATHEISM OF JEAN-PAUL SARTRE

By M. J. Marson, M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge

JEAN-PAUL Sartre proclaims himself an atheist and is taken at his face value by many thinkers, including Christians of an orthodox outlook. But is this really the case? His famous phrase that 'God is dead' seems to give a conclusive answer, yet all depends on the picture of God in the author's mind. Sartre is no theologian, nor is his chief claim to fame as a philosopher as great as is his insight into human character. His significance as a writer is his reflexion of the contemporary social scene. This is what one would be led to expect from his advocacy of *Littérature engagée*. It is through his brilliant portrayal of a disintegrating society that we must discover what he means by 'the Death of God.' To understand the mind of Sartre should be of value to contemporary thinkers, whether Christian or not.

In the first place it may be more than a coincidence that Jean-Paul Sartre is the child of parents of divided creeds. That experience in itself might create conditions in the mind of a child which would express themselves later in conflicts and 'anguish.' Is the God of whom Sartre speaks a Protestant or a Catholic one? It would be interesting, though probably fruitless to speculate on this; what is more to the point is to realise that Sartre thinks not in theological terms but in those of contemporary experience. In other words, when he says that God is dead he is thinking of orthodox views of God, whether of the Protestant or Catholic type; his God is the God of convention and the social order, of both Protestant and Catholic orthodoxy. This no doubt would account for the wholesale condemnation of his work by many religiously minded persons. Whether anything is to be learned from such a modern 'prophet' does not seem to enter into their picture. For such people Sartre is a menace to 'sound theology' as well as to social order and becomes an object of dislike and condemnation.

A more fruitful approach might be to ask in what respects modern society, as mirrored in the works of Sartre, has rejected traditional interpretations of Christianity, and to enquire further whether a more modern theological outlook can find something to learn from this *enfant terrible;* indeed whether a religion re-interpreted in terms of contemporary experience might not find points of contact with this 'atheist.' There is little doubt that some, if not many, of the positions defended by traditional theologians have proved untenable in the light of the thought and experience of the last half-century. In particular the method of describing God's nature and activity by analogy from human society should

be abandoned, since it identifies God with earthly rulers and ascribes to him their typical defects. Theories explaining God's 'providence' in history in purely rational terms are also untenable on the ground that they slur over the problem of evil and suffering. The Catholic ideal of a unified society in which all sides of life are integrated in a Christian philosophy cannot be maintained in the modern world. Such an ideal is too static, and does not allow either for the complexity of a high industrialized society, nor for the element of dynamism and growth which has played such a prominent part in the history of the last hundred years. Moreover, the Marxist exposure of power motives and class conflicts in society rules out the possibility of imposing theoretical notions of justice and harmony on actual historical situations.

The Protestant interpretation of God's will in the social order has fared no better under the judgment of events. The bourgeois worship of success, which at one time was associated with the Protestant ethic, did not survive the first World War. Similarly, the expression of religion within the limits of a rigid ethical code has proved impossible in the face of swift change and catastrophic situations. The chief contribution of Protestant thought in the nineteenth century was the interpretation of the Kingdom of God in terms of social progress. Liberalism of that kind, however, is in the main discredited. The shaking of the foundations of society, especially in the recent World War has exposed the narrowness and inadequacy of a religion based purely on conscience and individual 'salvation.'

Thus official attempts to give a content to such phrases as God's will which could serve us as a framework for thought for the modern man and make him at home in both Church and secular society have been shown wanting. Any remaining hopes of satisfactorily relating religion and actual life were shattered for large numbers of people by the social or economic disaster of unemployment and war. It is the fag end of this process and final shattering of hope which Sartre so brilliantly depicts in *Les Chemins de la Liberté*. When 'God is dead' and the social order has lost its meaning the individual finds himself in the position of a man who by some lucky chance has survived an explosion which has blown off the roof and destroyed the walls of his house, leaving him exposed to the elements and to the gaze of the public.

The intellectual framework and scale of values which support the life of the individual, having fallen away, each person is left alone with his own consciousness. Even his relation to other people is doubtful, for the notions of status and social function are the normal means, apart from personal relatedness, by which

we determine our attitude to others The resulting uncertainty and suspicion are conveyed in the phrase 'Hell is other people.' The Sartrian character is left in the necessity of perpetually making decisions but equally in the impossibility of doing so without any values by which to frame purpose and choice.

In the ordinary way the Christian is delivered from this sort of dilemma by the doctrine of Providence, which gives an orientation in the world and encourages a measure of acceptance of one's situation. This doctrine, however, is itself part of the traditional philosophy which has broken down and given rise to the 'absurd' situation of the atheistic existentialist; and in so far as the characters of Sartre's works represent the 'man of our time' they represent a challenge to Christian thinkers who maintain that their faith has a message for all men. The existential situation described as the 'Death of God' is the position of the modern man, whether he is a Christian or an atheist. This has been emphasized by Simone Weil and other original Christian thinkers reflecting on recent history. Thus to find a solution to the problem is vital for the survival of Christianity as an influential force. How can this be done?

If the traditional 'God' of reason and rational theology is to be discarded the vacant place must be filled by a new kind of theology which gives due place to the absurd, the tragic and the irrational elements of human life but also goes beyond them and offers a solution on a different level of experience; a theology which also recognizes the reality and significance of 'existential choice.'

A recent re-statement of the meaning of Protestantism offers signs of hope.[1] According to this view the essence of Christianity is a protest against any form of idolatry whether of Church, social system, creed, ethical code, etc. These idolatries arise from the natural tendency to seek refuge from the insecurity of life. This can be attempted in many ways: through churches with sacraments, or orthodox creeds, through mysticism, piety, secular religions such as Communism, Activism and so on: but there is no escape. Like Mathieu and many other characters created by the mind of Sartre, we are trapped. Human life and history are not explicable in rational terms or even in terms of continuous and logical development. Both stand under perpetual threat of disaster and their character is broken and fragmentary. This situation is the basis of tragedy in history. Whereas animals live by the automatic drive of instinct, man is not tied to his vital existence: he is both within and above it. To be a man means

[1] *The Protestant Era*, by Paul Tillich.

to transcend one's vital existence, and it is in this possibility that man's freedom consists. He can say Yes and No to 'life.' At the same time he is under a compulsion to raise questions about the true and the realization of the good: the fulfilment of his freedom consists in this even though he can never fully achieve his ends. He only realizes his true self when driven to the limits of human existence: it is then, when all artificial props have been pulled away that the consciousness of God 'breaks through' and renews his innermost being. Life is thus seen and interpreted through a paradox rather than through logical sequences or complete patterns of thought. If this thought is applied to our present situation it may be that God's activity is to be looked for even in the transformation that occurs when all accepted thoughts about God have been abandoned.

To those brought up along orthodox lines, who regard Christianity as a 'Revelation' or a 'Creed,' as a substance which can be, as it were, 'bottled' and handed on through an institution (the 'Church') by means of 'rational' thought-systems, a new interpretation of this kind will hardly appear as Christianity at all. That is perhaps not surprising, but it is typical of an age of dissolution and social change. There are indeed some who would deny the title of Christian to such a man as Albert Schweitzer, although his life of heroic sacrifice is regarded by others as one of the most inspiring examples of the activity of the Christian spirit in our time. If the era of institutional religion is passing then the Christianity of the future can only justify itself as a truth about human existence. Paradoxical as it may seem, a 'Churchless Christianity' or at least one in which the historic rôle of the Church has been greatly modified, is a possibility entertained by some leading personalities who have suffered for their faith and been forced to reflect on the situation of religion in a society where 'God is dead.' 'The thing that keeps coming back to me is, what *is* Christianity . . . for us to-day,' says Dietrich Bonhoffer.[2] 'What is the significance of a Church in a religionless world?'

Enough has been said to show that the dividing line between 'religion' and 'atheism' is not as sharp as is usually supposed if the peculiar conditions of our present existence are honestly faced. Here is a new and potentially fruitful situation, for the two sides need no longer consider themselves as enemies but may well learn from one another. Indeed the term 'atheism' itself is by no means satisfactory when applied to Sartre; it belongs to past periods of religious controversy rather than to the situation we

[2] *Letters and Papers from Prison.*

face to-day. It may well be that in spite of his present intransigence Sartre will in the future lean more towards the Christian side. The title of his recent play 'Le Diable and le Bon Dieu,' indicates that even though God is dead he is not easily forgotten. A similar difficulty of classification arises over the humanism of Albert Camus, who at the end of a review of the last 150 years of European history[3] reaches the conclusion that although there is no God the meaning of man's life is to be found, not in philosophic systems and theories but in protest against every oppression and injustice perpetrated against one's fellow men. Surely this is more than a Romantic absurdity, for a negative protest implies a positive force on behalf of which the protest is made. The present tendency of Christian theologians, overpowered by the shock of recent events, to emphasize the gulf between Christianity and Humanism, is surely to be deplored and if continued can only have the result of dividing the world into two camps bent on mutual destruction. There is as yet no satisfactory reconciliation between Christianity and Humanism but the Christian can learn from Sartre and other similar writers that the idea of a supernatural world used as an attempt to escape from the difficulties of this actual world is no longer tenable. In a modern society all men will have somehow to learn how to share a common environment; this is the truth behind the political slogans directed against 'privilege.' It seems also that any attempt to make existence 'secure' by trying to confine it to *a priori* categories or watertight systems of thought must be abandoned.

On the other hand the Christian can say that the 'human situation' described by Sartre is nothing new. He has merely stated the predicament of 'fallen man' in new terms. Wherever the Christian knows himself as a 'sinner,' Sartre merely finds himself *englué*. The state of 'freedom' points to the possibility of salvation but it is not to be realised in this mortal life: the consciousness of that kind of freedom is the 'evidence of things not seen.' It is man's fate to live in his consciousness and activities between these two poles. Every decision that is made—and man must decide and act in order to live and grow—is made within the relative conditions of a finite world, but it is in the choice that a man's 'soul' is made. Whether he chooses the higher or the lower path is man's responsibility, which counter-balances his inescapable freedom.

The defect of Sartre's philosophy is in the refusal to admit the possibility of a transcendent power which can 'break through' by

[3] *L'Homme Revolte.*

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

means of the human consciousness into the world of ordinary things. Thus Sartre cannot get away from himself and can never make a real choice.

To accept a valuation of life from a point of view behind and beyond the human consciousness delivers man from his subservience to the relativities of time, and the dehumanised life which results from reckoning all things in terms of quantity and in relation only to the self. It also gives a direction to thought which enables man to find a criterion by which to make decisions. May it not be that when all the complications of modern life are fully understood the way out of existential despair will be found in a new realisation and application of the Golden Rule?

THE LEGACY OF SIR JAMES FRAZER O.M., F.R.S., F.B.A.

By Dr. C. J. Wright, Rector of Barfrestone, near Dover

ON January the first, 1854, James George Frazer was born in Glasgow. On September the ninth, 1940, I received a much-treasured book from Lady Frazer with a kind and most generous note from her husband. The book was *James George Frazer, The Portrait of a Scholar*, by R. Angus Downie, who was assisting both husband and wife during their last years with the work the distinguished anthropologist had in hand. The note from Lady Frazer (which I have before me now) contains this sentence: 'Sir James is *very well* but is blind and paralyzed.' Not long after he died in their home in Cambridge, and twelve hours later Lady Frazer joined him in the realms beyond.

A few months before receiving this *Portrait* I had the great privilege of two hours intimate talk with Sir James. It was in a Harrogate hotel on a Sunday afternoon. That meeting and that conversation are vivid in my mind as I write this tribute for readers of *The Modern Churchman* of the greatest anthropologist of our times. He was then almost blind and was attended by Lady Frazer and a manservant. But his mind was as clear and his words were as pointed, truthful, and wise, as if he had been in the prime of life.

Before saying something about his contribution to liberal religious thought — a contribution that cannot yet be justly estimated in the atmosphere of fear prevailing in the world and pre-eminently among official churches and official religions—let me here recall one or two of the subjects then occupying his mind.

When he knew that I was living in Didsbury College,

Manchester, he spoke at once of James Hope Moulton, the distinguished Hellenistic scholar and student of Comparative Religions, who had done his life-work in that oldest of Methodist Colleges in the world. It is a melancholy reflection that Moulton died, with Rendel Harris at his side, in a small boat in the Mediterranean when the ship in which he was returning from lecturing in India on Early Zoroastrianism was torpedoed. This led Frazer to discuss his own early days in Glasgow and in Cambridge. His father's mistrust of ecclesiastical tendencies in Oxford had brought him to Trinity College, Cambridge. The comment of Albert Houtin on this is worth recall, as coming from a Frenchman of large, cultured, liberal and spiritual mind.

> 'Thanks to the wisdom of his father, James escaped the dangers of Anglican theology. But the best and most anti-episcopal of fathers cannot foresee every peril. A few years after his arrival at Cambridge there followed the most learned and probably most heterodox of his compatriots, a former college professor, discharged by his church, the Orientalist William Robertson Smith.'

Sir James spoke to me with deep feeling and great regard of the heretical Presbyterian who edited *The Encyclopaedia Britannica.* 'His was the greatest mind I ever met,' he said. His friendship with Robertson Smith stimulated his growing zeal for the study of his life-time—for his interest in anthropology had already been set alight by Tylor's classic, *Primitive Culture.*

He also asked many questions about the Churches in England. He was, of course, pre-eminently a liberal, and regarded 'superstition' as the main enemy of man's mind: yet was very mindful of the place ecclesiastical institutions must hold in the hearts of a truly progressive people. For that reason he listened with deep attention to what I told him of movements towards Unity: most especially of what had been said and done at the 1939 Modern Churchmen's Conference in Girton College, Cambridge. He did not hide his surprise that a Methodist minister had been invited to 'celebrate' Holy Communion in Girton's College Chapel to the members present and with the full approval of a Diocesan Bishop in the Church of England. That led him to discuss the aims and ideals of our Union. He seemed to be enheartened to find that old *Ecclesia Anglicana* was looking forward.

He also spoke of his classical and other studies. When I thanked him for his eminent contribution to liberal religious thought (*Folklore in the Old Testament: Studies in Comparative Religion, Legend, and Law*), he seemed, again, surprised to find that it was read and appreciated by at least one teacher in a theological college.

It is, however, by *The Golden Bough* that Frazer will be remembered in the church and the religion that is to be. Throughout his long life as a student—and he remained one until his death—anthropological studies took the first place. It was, therefore, with a quite special intensity that he spoke to me in 1940 of his Note-Books which he was then having published. These Note-Books contained extracts from anthropological literature from many countries and had been the basic labour behind his books. Published under the general title *Anthologia Anthropologica* they are a mine for every forward-looking student of religious thought and life.

In bringing to a close this brief and heart-felt tribute to a very great scholar, a very true gentleman, and a very spiritual mind, I wish to state my own judgment about the main and inspiring thought behind all his writings. 'He being dead yet speaketh' of the basic unity of mankind in thought and ideal. This unity was represented for him by the key ideas opening to us the mind of savage man. Symbols reveal this unity: the Priest of Ovid who slew the slayer and was himself slain; the Bough that Virgil's pious hero plucked on his way to the underworld; the god who took mortal shape and died for man; the earthly king who is the symbol of the cosmological myth; the harmony and parallel of human birth, fruition and death with Nature's cycle; the Sacrificial Feast of communion with deity.

I believe it is incontestably true, as the leading article in *The Times* for January the first, 1954, so penetratingly said: no new or newer ideas in anthropological study 'can invalidate the truth Frazer supremely illustrated, that of the spiritual kinship of all human kind.'

Anatole France said of him:

> *'Ce que Montesquieu fut dans son temps Frazer l'est dans le nôtre, et la différence de leurs oeuvres montre le progrés des idées.'*

Sir James Frazer wrote of the Bible in these words:

> 'The volume must still be held sacred by all who reverence the high inspiration to which it gives utterance . . . The reading of it breaks into the dull round of common life like a shaft of sunlight on a cloudy day, or a strain of music heard in a mean street. It seems to lift us for a while out of ourselves, our little cares and little sorrows, into communion with those higher powers, whatever they are, which existed before man began to be, and which will exist when the whole human race, as we are daily reminded by the cataclysms and convulsions of Nature, shall be swept away out of existence for ever. It strengthens in us the blind conviction, or the trembling hope, that somewhere, beyond these earthly shadows, there is a world of light eternal, where the obstinate questionings of the mind will be answered and the heart find rest.'

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND DIVORCE*

A Retrospective Survey

The clergyman who adopts a liberal attitude towards divorce puts himself into a very awkward position. It will be said at once that he is condoning a major social evil—and he will be hard put to if he is not to admit that this does appear to be the case. If he speaks of the innocent party he will be told, rightly enough, that such innocence is often no better than a legal fiction. If he mentions some particular instance he will bring upon himself the inevitable rejoinder that hard cases make bad law. Further it will be impressed upon him that he ought to understand that the law of the Church regarding divorce is of so stringent a nature that it can permit of no exceptions—not even in the hardest cases. Thus his whole attitude is made to look like one of plain disloyalty to his Church, to its standards and its teaching, and to the source of these in the Gospels themselves.

There can, of course, be no question that the Christian ideal of marriage is lifelong and indissoluble union. But because this is the ideal, the assertion that the very possibility of divorce ought not to come within the Christian purview is nowadays made so often and so authoritatively, that it is becoming a matter of some temerity to challenge that assertion at all. Yet it does in fact beg the question—or rather a good many questions. And before any such assertion can be substantiated as the undoubted teaching of the Church of England, a good deal that has happened in the past needs to be explained away. But the present tendency is to overlook difficulties rather than explain them. It is well known that a slogan can often be a more effective weapon than a sustained argument: and the constant repetition of such a maxim as 'The Church can under no circumstances permit divorce' is of more importance to the success of the rigorist cause than the strict truth of the maxim itself. When once that has become embodied in a legally enforceable Canon Law, its exact truth will no longer be anybody's business to question.

It cannot, certainly, be said that Mr. Haw's scholarly and painstaking book, *The State of Matrimony*, burkes a full discussion of the subject in this sort of fashion. On the contrary, he seeks to show by detailed argument that the Church of England has all along adhered to the doctrine of the pre-Reformation Church in permitting divorce *a mensa et thoro,* but not from the bond of matrimony itself. Nevertheless it may be doubted whether very many readers, who were not convinced of its truth already, will be persuaded by this book to accept the thesis which it proposes. The Church's attitude towards divorce in early times was clearly far from uniform. Origen disapproved of remarriage after divorce, but says that he knew of Bishops who did not share his views. The Matthean exception in the case of *porneia* (*Matt.* v, 32; xix, 9) was given widely different interpretations. And although it is true that prior to the Reformation the divorce law of the Western Church had become precise and straightforward enough in theory, it is notorious that in the words of Mandell Creighton, 'the mediaeval system was a mass of fictions and subterfuges'. Mr. Haw is obliged to confess as much himself.

Nevertheless he maintains that after the Reformation the Church of England still held firmly to the theory that the marriage bond, once it had

* *The State of Matrimony*, by Reginald Haw. (S.P.C.K., 1952; 21/-.)

been validly formed, could be dissolved only by death. It was here, he thinks, that the English Church parted company decisively with Calvin and Luther, who both repudiated the mediaeval view. Although for the next three hundred years divorces were occasionally granted on petition to the House of Lords, they were too few in number for the Church to feel that by keeping silence in face of them, or even by allowing remarriage to take place, its principles were being seriously compromised.

The question of the Church's attitude during this period is certainly hard to determine. Since divorce was so infrequent an occurrence there is naturally not much evidence to go upon. But it is difficult to feel that Mr. Haw's case is entirely conclusive. He says nothing, for example, of such important divines as Andrewes and Laud, who, to quote Creighton again, 'had no fixed principles on the subject.' In fact the whole period from Cranmer to the nineteenth century is passed over in less than ten pages.

But the case presented in this book is really at it weakest just where it ought to be strongest, and that is in the Church's reaction to the Divorce Bill of 1857. We are on firmer ground here as we come to more modern times, and what happened is surely highly significant. Here was a bill not only designed to facilitate the granting of divorce, but which also permitted both the innocent and the guilty partner to seek remarriage at the Church's hands, and gave to the former the same right to be married in Church as belonged to any other parishioner. In that form both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, together with nine other bishops, voted in the House of Lords in its favour. While it is true that some bishops opposed the Bill, and several thousand of the clergy petitioned against it (much as they petitioned against the Doctrinal Report, eighty years later), would not the protest have been far stronger, and far more sustained, if the very impossibility of divorce from the Christian standpoint had been so undoubted a part of Anglican belief as we are now expected to recognize? For in fact, the protest having been made, it was not continued. The Bill was accepted, perhaps with a bad grace, but accepted none the less. For good or ill it made obvious what had been less apparent before—that the rigorist doctrine was already, as Mr. Haw admits, 'heavily compromised by the fact that the clergy had tacitly agreed in the past that they were obliged to marry those whose divorce had been procured by means of a private Bill.'

Undoubtedly the Church of England was compromised. Rightly or wrongly it had admitted that the view that the bond of matrimony was not indissoluble was one which, at all events, it did not officially repudiate. It was for this reason, of course among others, that the South African Church, holding to the stiff Tractarian view that divorce was impermissible, separated itself 'root and branch' (as the Privy Council subsequently declared it to have done) from the Church of England which found room for a more accommodating attitude.

Three outstanding figures of the later nineteenth century will suffice to illustrate that attitude. Tait, as Bishop of London, had frankly welcomed the Bill of 1857, even to the extent of preferring that no discretion should be given to the clergy in deciding whether to remarry the innocent party or not. Forty years later, Mandell Creighton wrote as follows:

> 'We as Christians abhor divorce: but when a divorce has been judged necessary, are we to refuse any liberty to the innocent and wronged party? . . . I could not advise any of my clergy to refuse to solemnise a marriage of an innocent person who genuinely desired God's blessing. I prefer to err on the side of charity.'

Even more forthright and illuminating are the views expressed by Frederick Temple. Asked by a clergyman whether he was bound to say that the Church would not recognize the remarriage of a divorced person, the Archbishop replied brusquely, 'Certainly not.' Asked whether such a person, if the innocent party, should be encouraged to contract a civil marriage in preference to being remarried in Church, he answered, 'No'; and added, 'The Church always strongly dissuaded the innocent party from re-marrying, but never forbade it.'

But already the tide was begining to turn. Mr. Haw describes how the Lambeth Conference of 1888 rejected a proposal that the Bishop of the Diocese should decide whether a clergyman might remarry a divorced person or not. Twenty years later the Conference of 1908 passed by a bare majority a resolution that not even the innocent party ought to be remarried with the Church's blessing. Twenty years later again, the Lambeth Conference of 1930 overwhelmingly endorsed a similar resolution and recommended further that 'Where an innocent person has remarried under civil sanction and desires to receive Holy Communion, the case should be referred for consideration of the Bishop.'

Now it is perfectly legitimate to argue that the Church is obliged to harden its heart towards the most innocent of divorced persons in view of the deplorable increase in the incidence of divorce. But it is nonsense to pretend that the views of the Church of England upon the whole subject have never been in doubt. The truth is that upon this as upon other questions the Church of England has hitherto found room for widely differing schools of thought. The increase in divorce is not more responsible for the prevalent attitude of the Church towards it than is the increasing hold upon the Church of England of clergy of an Anglo-Catholic theology. To suppose on the other-hand that pressure of circumstances has at last brought the Church to a clear appreciation of what has always been its true belief regarding divorce—that the pure truth is at last revealed after being obscured by the mists of four centuries is as impertinent as it is absurd. Indeed, although there is some weight in the contention that the pronouncements of men like Frederick Temple and Creighton require to be modified in the light of all that has since happened, even this argument should not be pressed too far. It may have needed more courage to speak as they did at a time when divorce was still a comparatively rare occurrence, and shocking to polite society, than it would do to-day when divorce has become so lamentably familiar and even commonplace. At all events, despite the high incidence of divorce to-day, it is almost certainly the case that *there are less divorced people who now desire to be remarried in Church than half a century ago.* Thus it may be said that this essential crux of the Church's problem is not really so pressing as *prima facie* it might appear to be.

In short, however, much we may deplore the divorce statistics of recent years, they cannot be held to justify the absolute negation with which the Church of England is now being urged to confront the whole issue. To do so, indeed, is hardly to confront it at all, but rather to evade it. Moreover it is wholly inadequate to plead, as Mr. Haw and others have done, that men like Tait and Temple were led astray by the Matthean exceptions, which in the light of a critical scholarship denied to them are now discovered to have no place in the authentic message of Jesus Christ. Such an argument surely comes strangely from Anglo-Catholic quarters; one seems to remember that similar arguments advanced by Liberal Protestants in different contexts have not generally been well received by them. But, of course, the issue cannot be made to depend upon one or two isolated texts. It depends in reality

upon whether Bishop Gore is right in saying that He who refused to legislate upon so many subjects did legislate on this one. Certainly in this instance Dean Inge's observation would appear to be true, that what the Church of England is to-day, Bishop Gore has made it. But the great Bishop was not infallible all the same. He had more than one blind spot beyond which his vision could not or would not penetrate. He saw this matter as a simple question whether we prefer the authority of Christ to any other authority whatever. But the question is not really a simple one; far from it.

> 'If,' wrote Hensley Henson, 'we would understand rightly the law of marriage according to Christ we cannot limit ourselves to a few texts from the Gospels, but we must take into our reckoning the whole movement of Christian thought during the many centuries of the existence of Christianity, and in the power of the Holy Spirit, present still as always before with Christian men, determine what shall be the actual obligation of discipleship here and now . . . The teaching of Christ is rather implicit in the Gospel than specifically set down in pronouncements. The Christian doctrine of marriage must give free expression to the "mind of Christ" as unfolded in the Gospel; and just in measure as the Gospel is truly appreciated will that doctrine be satisfying and permanent' (*Christian Marriage*, p. 29 and p. 48).

'There is danger of making marriage too difficult,' said Phillips Brooks; and the words of the great American preacher might well be heeded by the Church to-day. The pursuance of its present policy can lead only to one of two things. One is the unsavoury chaos of the mediaeval system which started by saying that a valid marriage could not be broken and ended by finding it virtually impossible to determine what constituted such a marriage or how it could be contracted. Clearly no one wishes for this. The other alternative is the recognition of a double standard of morality by which a secular marriage contracted before a civil registrar and a marriage solemnized in Church would be frankly distinguished. This appears to be the solution which Mr. Haw would contemplate. But to quote Bishop Henson again:

> 'The temptation of the Church under modern conditions is to draw apart from the popular life, repudiating its moral laxity, and marking by a deep dividing line of artificial discipline the frontiers of Christianity. It is both unreasonable and unjust to yield to this temptation' (*op. cit.* p. 141).

It is perhaps in the recalling of these opinions from the past that there lies the best hope of a rupture with the past being avoided. The Hensons and the Temples, the Taits and the Creightons do indeed belong to the past, and one looks in vain for their successors on the Episcopal Bench to-day. The genius of the Church of England, one suspects, is identified in some of their Lordships' minds with the atmosphere of the particular seminaries where they studied for the G.O.E. Meanwhile, to those of us who would wish to maintain a wider vision, albeit from so much more lowly a vantage point, the words of St. Paul become clothed with a fresh insistence:

With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage.

D. L. Scott

H. R. MACKINTOSH AND KARL BARTH COMPARED*

This book, *A Theology of Transition. H. R. Mackintosh as an approach to Barth,* was accepted by the University of Basle as a dissertation for the Doctorate of Theology. The study was undertaken at the suggestion of Karl Barth himself, who writes a brief foreword to it. The object of the book is to show how Mackintosh, the saintly scholar who for many years held the chair of Systematic Theology at New College, Edinburgh, gradually shifted his theological position, being in his earlier period considerably influenced by the Ritschlians, but finally coming to a position not unlike that of Barth. This is the transition spoken of in the title.

The author aims to show that the later development of Mackintosh's thought was already implicit in his earlier works and that even where his langdage in these closely resembles that employed by Ritschlians there are subtle but fundamental differences in the nature of the thought itself. Precisely because of the subtlety of many of the arguments, no mere casual reading of this able study will suffice, but a careful reading accompanied by individual searching of heart will certainly bring a reward, not necessarily by reason of an agreement with the position reached, but because of the powerful presentation of a challenge to what may be and probably is a very different position held by most Modern Churchmen. When Karl Barth was invited to deliver the Gifford Lectures, he replied that he had no use for Natural Theology and so could not comply with the terms of the Will of Lord Gifford. When still pressed he agreed to give the lectures, saying that on second thoughts his own views could do a service to Natural Theology by challenging it with a theology resting entirely on Revelation. It is for the same reason that this book deserves the consideration of members of the M.C.U. and of others who may sympathize with its aims.

The detailed discussions of the main body of the work are well summarized in a relatively brief concluding chapter, and one good way of mastering the contents would be to digest this first, and then with this general map of the main roads in hand, to proceed to the fuller treatment in Chapter ii (The Fundamental Principles of Dogmatic), and in Chapter iii (The Concept of God). Chapter i is a very good general introduction.

We may now deal briefly with a few of the main issues. Mackintosh was attracted by the Ritschlian reaction to Hegel shown by emphasis on human value-judgments and especially the *practical* conception of the Christian Faith as satisfying men's moral needs.

> 'Yet it was precisely here that he first laid the finger of criticism upon Ritschl's work, for he protested from the beginning that whatever needs true religon may satisfy, it is essentially with God for His own sake, and to make it anything else is to put man and his ideals at the centre instead of God' (p. 191).
>
> 'God is more than moral . . . so that mere moral values however important, can never be the primary interest of faith' (p. 191).

The crucial point is not whether we start from the Word, or from Experience (Schleiermacher):

> 'It is whether in the one case the Word is truly Divine, or simply an echo of man's own words; and whether in the other case it is a Divine Spirit which calls forth and sustains man's faith, or merely a reflection of his own spirit on the clouds . . .'

as he thinks it is with Ritschl.

* *A Theology of Transition. H. R. Mackintosh as an approach to Barth,* by James W. Leitch. (Nisbet, 1952; 15/-.)

God has the initiative and has taken it. By an act of faith which is a direct response to the Godhead in the Person of Christ we have a genuine reconciliation with God, and our conduct then is guided by gratitude and love, and not by a mere sense of duty.

The doctrine of the Trinity (however mysterious and hard to understand; cf. pp. 142-153) is necessary to establish Christ's deity, without which we have no genuine divine revelation, and also to establish the living and present work of the Holy Spirit. Mackintosh, says our author, was well aware that Christian faith

> 'is created and sustained *solely* by the sovereign revelation of God in Christ . . . For that reason believing conviction is both a tremendous venture and an unparalleled certainty. Again and again the believer makes what may well be called a leap in the dark, abandoning every ground on which man normally seeks to verify the truth and finds himself not in the dark but in the hand of God, with all his standards of value transformed from top to bottom, and with such an assurance of the truth as the world can neither give nor take away, because it rests not on the shifting sands of mere human ideals, but on the rock of Christ.'

One may well question how the 'tremendous *venture*' can at the same time be an utter *certainty*. Does the author mistake certitude for certainty? And is a non-believer really assisted by the employment of such phrases?

The Resurrection, . . . whatever doubts of the Gospel accounts are set in motion by modern historical inquiry, is a necessity, says Mackintosh, to establish the deity of Christ and so the genuineness of the Divine revelation. Faith here sets a wide gap between Christianity and other religions, which Mackintosh thinks the Ritschlians take too little account of. The historical life of Jesus 'between Bethlehem and Calvary' is not enough.

> 'The pre-existence and present sovereignty of Christ are . . . supremely important, since apart from them there could be no revelation at all, and therefore neither authentic faith nor good theology' (p. 198).

All this leads to a subtle difference of view *re* the nature of the Kingdom of God. Where Ritschl emphasises the this-wordly application, Mackintosh puts the emphasis elsewhere.

> 'The Kingdom of God is no purely mundane realm of moral ends, but a transcendent eschatological reality embracing both the spiritual and natural order . . . the complete and final sovereignty of the Father over all creation which is to be manifested at the last but is even now a present fact for faith' (p. 199).

There is little space here to deal with Mackintosh's attitude to Philosophy and Natural Religion, but this is implicit in what has already been said. Employed outside and independently of the faith in Revelation given in the Scriptures, these may merely stand for a sinful pride which man has in his own unaided powers of reason. Nevertheless Mackintosh has more use for them than have the Ritschlians; especially in his earlier period he is willing to accept their aid, provided they are used to elucidate what is already implicit in the Faith. In fact Philosophy reverts to its mediaeval status as the handmaid of Religion or rather of Theology.

The close resemblance to Barth is fairly clear, and it is to be concluded that our author has successfully made out his case for the transition spoken of in the title.

The view reached will, of course, have great value for all who find themselves capable of the initial act of faith. But what of the enormous number of sincere thinkers who find it increasingly difficult to do so in view of many factors in our modern mental atmosphere, and not least in view of the doubts raised concerning the real authority of the Scriptures as we have them, as a result of historical and textual criticism? With these the author does not deal, but they, together with some deeper questions, remain and will not suffer themselves to be ignored.

At the recent Oxford Conference, Dr. Bezzant delivered an arresting paper entitled 'The Continuing Task of Liberal Theology' (reprinted in the *Modern Churchman,* September, 1953) in which he made many highly pertinent remarks on the type of theology here represented. To this article the reviewer would respectfully refer Dr. Leitch as well as any of his readers who find themselves carried away by this undoubtedly sincere and—from its own point of view—very able book.

W. H. Axford

THE RIDDLE OF BISHOP LLOYD*

'What am I to do with such a riddle of a man as you are?' wrote Lloyd to an unsatisfactory Worcestershire cleric; and as Dr. Tindal Hart observes, Lloyd himself presents his biographer with much the same question. For few men, surely, can have been so full of contradictions as he was: tolerant towards dissenters, yet a martinet towards those of his own communion, and unable to endure the least personal affront; a stickler for the law, yet always ready to ride rough shod over it if it stood in his way; a scholar who possessed a strong belief in reason, who could none the less descend to a futile pedantry and bring himself into ridicule by interpreting the present and predicting the future out of the Books of *Daniel* and *Revelation.*

But, as Dr. Tindal Hart points out, Lloyd lived at a time which was peculiarly full of contradictions. He was in fact a child of his age—

> 'an age which could execute Charles I, restore one of his sons to the throne with tumultuous joy, and send another packing when he put their loudmouthed doctrines of divine right and passive obedience to the test of practical politics; which sought at one moment to placate the Dissenters with conferences and comprehension schemes, and the next to persecute them with occasional conformity and schism acts; which followed Oates and Dangerfield in their denunciations of the papists, and then, turning on its leaders, whipped them to Tyburn; which welcomed Locke's *Reasonableness of Christianity,* and swallowed Lloyd's prophecies; which lauded the latitudinarianism of Tillotson while condemning the Arianism of Whiston' (*William Lloyd,* p. 249).

Lloyd lived through all this. Born in 1627, he took his degree at Oxford a few weeks after the Civil War had begun, and survived to see the chequered fortunes of the Stewart cause finally overthrown by the Hanoverian succession before his death as Bishop of Worcester in 1717, less than a fortnight after his ninetieth birthday.

To the strangeness of his life is added the strange fact that Lloyd has hitherto lacked a biographer. But this ommision Dr. Tindal Hart has now made good in a most satisfactory manner. In doing so he has relied to a large extent upon previously unpublished materials, and the result is a highly interesting and informative picture of the life and times of this enigmatic prelate.

* *William Lloyd.* By A. Tindal Hart, M.A., D.D. (S.P.C.K., 1952; 30/-.)

But whatever else may have been obscure about him, Lloyd was quite clearly a cosummate trimmer. Thus, while gaining high approval from the Presbyterian 'triers' during the Commonwealth, he managed to keep in touch with the exiled court at Paris—rumour even said that he had preached in the embassy chapel there—and was suitably rewarded after the Restoration, first with a canonry of Ripon, then with the Deanery of Bangor and the Vicarage of St. Martin in the Fields. As Vicar of St. Martin's Lloyd was brought into especial prominence through the murder of Sir Edmund Godfrey and the alleged discovery of the Popish Plot. Godfrey had been Churchwarden there, and accordingly it fell to the Vicar to preach his funeral sermon. This he did, attended in the pulpit by two hefty divines whose apparent duty it was to protect him in case of violence—a spectacle which caused an eyewitness to exclaim:

> 'Three parsons in one pulpit! Enough of itself on a less occasion to excite terror in the audience' (*op. cit.* p. 28).

But this was no ordinary occasion, and so zealous was the preacher for the Protestant cause, so confident that Jesuitry lay behind the outrage that had been committed, that the Privy Council decided to make use of Lloyd to extort confessions from the prisoners. So successfully did he do this that he was presently advanced to the Bishopric of St. Asaph.

There for a while he was able to pursue his favourite policy of tolerance towards Protestant Dissent, while subjecting his conforming clergy and laity to a rigorous discipline. But amid the strange see-saw of events which the seventeenth century was witnessing, it was not long before the Rye House Plot reversed the sentiments that the Popish Plot had occasioned, so that with high Toryism now triumphant and Dissent suspected of treason Lloyd had reason to fear that he might himself fall under suspicion. At once he turned right about and began to denounce his erstwhile Nonconformist friends as 'bloody wretches' against whom he urged that the Sheriffs should be careful to do their duty.

> ''Tis visible,' he wrote, 'that all this while we have been treating with these Sectaries, it has been God's wonderful providence that when they mustered in their conventicles they had not come to cut our throats' (*op. cit.* p. 48).

On one occasion only does Lloyd appear in a more steadfast role—when after the accession of James II he has one of the Seven Bishops who were sent to the Tower. Of this episode Dr. Tindal Hart gives a vivid and detailed account, pointing out that:

> 'It has been popularly but falsely believed ever since that the bishops were sent to the Tower because they refused to read the Declaration of Indulgence, whereas in reality they went there because they stood firm on the purely technical point of their privilege as peers. It has, indeed, been argued that they had another and ulterior motive for their obstinacy. "The bishops, perhaps, had some motive in forcing the King to imprison them; for he would not only have taken their recognizance, but even their word, for their appearance. Both were refused because an imprisonment would inflame the nation, and prevent the Archbishop of Canterbury from being at the Queen's delivery"' (*op. cit.* p. 106).

Of the seven bishops, all except Lloyd and Trelawney subsequenly became non-jurors. It was only to be expected, therefore, that the Glorious Revolution should bring higher preferment to both of them. Lloyd, indeed, while professing his undying loyalty to King James had been engaged for some time in

correspondence with the Prince of Orange, urging him to make a bid for the throne. Accordingly upon the latter's accession he was appointed Lord High Almoner, though he had to wait until 1692 until something better than the poor see of St. Asaph could be found for him. In that year he was made Bishop of Lichfield, and promoted to the wealthy diocese of Worcester seven years later.

Despite these political intrigues to which his preferment was so largely due, Dr. Tindal Hart shows that Lloyd was none the less conscientious in the exercise of his proper episcopal functions, even though he usually spent half the year outside his diocese. He was careful to hold triennial visitations and frequent confirmations, announcing on one occasion, when well past seventy years of age, that he would preach and confirm that summer in every market town of his diocese—an example which his modern successors, in spite of their smaller dioceses and rapid means of transport, seldom seem able to follow. Even the harshness of his disciplinary measures seems more than excusable in view of the sorry conditions which he encountered. Thus in his visitation of 1702 he found one parish where there was no one to officiate because the minister was in prison, another which had a curate but no congregation, another where the Sacrament could not be administered because the communion plate had been pawned, and many where the fabric of the church was falling into decay, 'each with its own particular area of ruin or neglect, variously attributed to incumbent, churchwardens or parishioners'. Contrary to popular opinion it would appear from all this that the state of the Church must have improved rather than deteriorated as the eighteenth century proceeded.

At times, however, as Dr. Tindal Hart makes plain, nothing could have been more unseemly than the conduct of the bishop himself. His attempt in this same year, 1702, to get rid of a Tory M.P. who had fallen foul of him is almost incredibly grotesque.

> 'Lloyd . . . did not scruple to achieve this purpose. Indeed, the bishop and his son, who was himself standing as a proctor for Convocation, opened a propaganda campaign of vilification and abuse of the worthy squire of Westwood which reflected little credit either on their Christianity or common sense. The clergy were ordered by their diocesan to vote and work against the knight, if they hoped for future promotion; while Mr. Lloyd threatened and browbeat, and in one instance at least actually indulged in physical violence against, his father's tenants'.

In spite of all this Sir John Packington was sent back to Westminster with an increased majority.

> 'Whereupon, and not unnaturally, he instituted proceedings at the Bar of the House of Commons, "against William, Lord Bishop of Worcester, and Mr. Lloyd, his son". The Worcestershire clergy and the Bishop's own tenants were called as witnesses to give evidence against their spiritual father, and proved over and over again the violent, unscrupulous, dictatorial, and quite illegal methods employed by Lloyd to persuade them to vote as he wished, or at worst to abstain from voting; methods which were a gross abuse of his episcopal calling and duties' (*William Lloyd,* pp. 157-158).

As a result Lloyd was deprived of his office of Lord High Almoner; but as this was transferred to his friend Archbishop Sharp, he was still able to keep a finger in the pie. No doubt it had been a surprise to him to find even a member of Parliament refusing to bow to his behest, for Lloyd was not accustomed to opposition. At St. Asaph, for example, not only had he forbade

the cathedral choir to attend service in cravat, lace or periwig; he had even persuaded the chapter to erect a new seat for his wife and pay for it out of cathedral funds! Again when expounding prophecy before the Queen, we are told how

> 'the Earl of Oxford, offering to give another interpretation to one of his texts than he did, though in extreme civil terms, the bishop turned to the Queen in the greatest passion I ever saw any man, and told her, "So says your treasurer, but God says otherwise, whether he like it or no". The Queen seeing him so angry and rude, called for her dinner . . .' (Burnet's *History,* cited by Hart, p. 177).

Taking him all in all it is evident that Lloyd was neither an admirable nor an attractive personality. But in some respects at least his character is less remote from the present day than at first glance it might appear to be. He would, for example, have entered with relish into the revision of Canon Law and the devising of ways for its strict enforcement; and it may be thought that his strange methods of biblical exegesis have more than a little affinity with the quaint modern cult of typology. Be that, however, as it may we can be grateful to Dr. Tindal Hart for the life-like picture of the man which he has given us. He has been wise to present his inherent contradictions unresolved, and not to attempt a detailed interpretation of them. Although to Dean Swift Lloyd appeared to be 'the dullest, good-for-nothing man I ever knew', Dr. Tindal Hart gives us good reason for thinking (as his publishers claim) that Lloyd was on the contrary—for all that he was such a riddle of a man—'an important, illuminating and fascinating figure'.

D. L. Scott

CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND

In reading Dean Malden's *The English Church and Nation*[1] we traverse the whole course of English history, in which the Church plays so great a part. Church and Nation are interwoven and inseparable, if we assume that the beginning of our English history coincides with the withdrawal of the Roman legions and the establishment of the Christian faith by Augustine in the sixth century and Aidan in the seventh during which period the Church of England really took root.

Here in this book we have a clear account of the growth of our Church, an account which is authoritative, well documented and scholarly. As the late Dean Malden points out, it is always a problem how far the Church should identify itself with the State. The three positions possible are, he says: (*a*) The domination of the State by the Church; (*b*) The domination of the Church by the State; (*c*) The independence of the Church by separation from the State. None of these positions is satisfactory says the writer. In its close and official contact with the government there is, of course, the danger of the Church losing its spiritual character. On the other hand the withdrawal of the Church altogether from State affairs would create a cold detached secular State, without that inspiration which the presence of the Church with its ideals provides. It would seem that the nation and the Church derive the maximum of benefit by the present arrangement, for the dignity of the State is greatly enhanced by the official association. For example, a coronation without its religious setting would be without significance, and how could the great national days of prayer and thanksgiving have a fitting expression if the Church were absent? It is not so much a

[1] *The English Church and Nation.* By The Very Rev. R. H. Malden, formerly Dean of Wells. (S.P.C.K., 1952; 25/-.)

question of the Church needing the support of the State as the State needing the services of the Church. It is, however, a mistake to regard Church and State as two separate entities for the Church is an integral part of the nation. It is the medium through which the spiritual nature of the people is developed and finds expression.

The Church is something more than an institution which functions on special national occasions. Its real work is done quietly, regularly and reverently in the parish churches where parson and people form a small corporate Christian body. It is in the parish, as Dean Malden maintains, that the strength of the Church lies, for it is there that the religious qualities of our people find their highest expression. While English churchmen have a high regard for tradition and are aware that obedience to the law is an essential element of an ordered society, there is also a demand for liberty of thought and the individual's right to exercise it. The aim of our educationalists, Matthew Arnold for example, was to produce the Christian gentleman, the individual whose life was controlled and directed by inner Christian ideals which had been acquired in the course of his education and certainly not governed entirely by an external authority. It was Oscar Wilde who said, after his conversion to Rome, that Roman Catholicism was the most comfortable of all religions—presumably because the layman was excused from exercising his own moral judgment. All he had to do was to follow the instructions given by the Church authorities.

Such a totalitarian system is alien to a modern national Church which realizes that no educational institution deserves to survive if it ignores the progress of thought, the discovery of new truths and the expanding moral duties which an evolving civilization demands.

L. Forster

SCIENTISM AND RELIGION*

This interesting and for the most part clearly written book, *Scientism, Man and Religion,* by D. R. G. Owen, deals with the relationship between Science and Religion, a topic which some might think to have been already treated *ad nauseam.* The limitations of the scientific method are to-day clearly recognized by most thoughtful men including the scientists themselves, and the chief merit of this book lies not so much in their recapitulation, as in the attempt to indicate the great dangers which beset our present world and to trace these to what the author considers to be their main source, *viz.* Scient*ism, i.e.* the view that science alone can give knowledge. Thus science, valuable and necessary as it is, is set up as an idol in place of Religion, which is widely regarded as superfluous and untenable. Having eliminated Values, Spirit, and Freedom, with which the scientific, analytic, quantitative, and deterministic methods cannot deal, the worship of the idol leads naturally and almost inevitably to a purely relativistic morality, a worship of mere expediency in place of eternal moral principles, a disregard for any but material benefits, and to a social set-up in which (to quote the author)

> ' men find themselves, at the end of a scientific age, not free, but enslaved in new and more terrible forms of bondage ' (p. 24).

The main thesis is worked out with praiseworthy clarity in the three main parts of the essay. In Part I the growth of Dialectical Materialism and of Communism are seen to be due to an exaggerated faith in science dressed up in a sociological and economic outfit.

* *Scientism, Man and Religion,* by D. R. G. Owen. (Philadelphia, Westminster Press; three dollars, fifty cents.)

'Materialistic or sociological scientism develops more or less unconscious and haphazard presuppositions of the general "scientific" climate of opinion into explicit, coherent, and interconnected dogmas. The empiricistic axiom becomes a pseudo-scientific dogmatism; the materialistic bias becomes the doctrine of dialectical materialism; the mechanistic assumption becomes the cry of economic determinism and ideological relativism; and the optimistic presupposition becomes the dogma of the coming classless society—Marxism simply makes these notions clear and definite, while Communism puts them into practice' (p. 47).

In practice, instead of a classless society:

'In totalitarianism the state becomes omnipotent, omniscient, the source of all law and of all truth. In other words, the state replaces God. The abolition of God leads to the deification of the state; the deification of the state results in the abolition of man' (p. 53).

'It is scientism which has brought man to this end. It begins by disregarding God and the realm of spirit; it concentrates attention on the physical world; it interprets man in materialistic and mechanistic categories that are appropriate to nature; it advocates a "scientific" society in which there is no room for human beings' (p. 53).

In Part II the growth of Nazism is similarly traced *via* the absolutism of Hobbes, the 'soft' naturalism of Rousseau and the theories of Feuerbach. But the most interesting chapter deals with the part played by the Freudian psychology which exalts the Id and the Pleasure-principle, and explains away the human conscience, in which God is regarded as an illusion arising from the Œdipus Complex. In an acute chapter the author subjects all this to severe criticism.

'Man's physical environment can best be understood, controlled and improved by scientific methods. And in so far as man is himself a part of nature, his social organization and psychical apparatus can be handled in the same way and with the same beneficial results. If the social and psychological sciences were to recognize that man is also a free spirit with heights and depth beyond their reach . . . they would take their rightful place and make their invaluable contributions to human welfare' (p. 124).

In Part III, the argument is brought still nearer home and applied to Capitalism and the Western world. Mere utilitarianism, mere pragmatism, empiricism (going beyond its true powers), and Logical-positivism which regards God, for example, as a meaningless term are regarded as the avenues which have led to a

'bourgeois society, which worships science, the machine, and the dollar. And just as empirical scientism must either deteriorate into complete scepticism, or else harden into a dogmatic mould that resembles the other two versions, so also the culture that it nurtures is faced with only two alternatives . . . either it will disintegrate in aimless confusion, or else it will petrify into some kind of "scientific" mass society' (p. 156).

What then is the cure?

'The hope of modern democracy resides in the fact that its roots reach down to a tradition that is older and wiser than the "scientific."... We have not altogether lost our hold upon this wisdom from the past; and it is for this reason that in spite of all the teachings of naturalism, determinism, relativism, and agnosticism, we nevertheless retain our faith in the free responsible human spirit; in the reality of goodness,

beauty, truth, and justice; and in the principles of religion. These beliefs must be revived and deepened if the Western world is to be rescued from the fate that seems to be reserved for a "scientific" age' (p. 174).

Man is not only a natural object but also a *subject*. Science may to some extent reach him as the former, but not as the latter. This is the realm of wisdom rather than of scientific abstractions.

With all this most of us will be in cordial agreement, and the book deserves to be widely read. If only its message could reach the 'inert mass' of people in this and other lands, some useful results might accrue. The author is scrupulously fair throughout, and there is no special pleading.

In the earlier part of the book one feels that his remarks on science apply with greater truth to the earlier 'classical' theories of the pre-relativity, pre-quantum period, and it is not until p. 164 that some reference is made to the more modern developments. Until reaching this point, it was felt by the reviewer that a careful study of Eddington's *The Philosophy of Science* would probably cause the author to reshape some of his remarks.

In the concluding section of the book, we should value a clearer treatment of the distinction he wishes to make between Spirit and Soul, and of the relation between these and Body. His remarks on p. 188 concerning the resurrection of the body seem to require further treatment.

It may well be that the criticism of the scientific categories by scientists themselves will lead them (indeed is doing so) to adopt and apply non-mechanistic ones and so open up the road to the more widespread worship of God again. Ought it not then to be the task of religious leaders themselves to prepare the way by purging Christianity itself of its materialistic elements and propounding a truly spiritual version?

W. H. Axford

THE SHRINE OF THOMAS À BECKET

England has three patron saints: St. Edward the Confessor whose shrine is Westminster Abbey. He is our royal patron saint. Thomas à Becket whose shrine is Canterbury Cathedral. He is our papal patron saint. St. George of Merry England. He is our popular national saint whose shrine is in Windsor Castle. His body, if ever he had one, possesses no traditional burial place. He, as our National Saint, replaced Edward the Confessor in the fourteenth century when English soldiers, fighting on French battlefields, were heard to say, inspired by John Wyclif's preachers: 'If the Pope is a Frenchman, Jesus Christ is an Englishman.' Yet it was at that time that Geoffrey Chaucer wrote his *Canterbury Tales* putting on record the life-like personalities of pilgrims

'. . . from every shire's end
Of England, to Canterbury they wend
The holy, blissful martyr for to seek.'

The religious situation in England was getting very mixed at that time.

Canterbury Cathedral[1], by Hugh Ross Williamson, can be read with the keenest pleasure by those who combine a basic knowledge of English ecclesiastical architecture with a sympathetic understanding of the religion of English Churchmen. This book is so lively that it needs no illustrations to enable it to fire the imagination of its reader who will, however, be intensely

[1] *Canterbury Cathedral.* By Hugh Ross Williamson. (Country Life Ltd., 1953; 12/6.)

grateful for the fifty-four illustrations which adorn it and not least for that of the Tower of Bell Harry.

It was at Canterbury that Egbert, the first English king to be converted to Christianity, was baptized in 596 by Augustine; but Canterbury Cathedral, dedicated to Christ (Christchurch), does not date from that event. There is nothing in the present building which is definitely pre-Norman.

Although the Cathedral owes much to the Archbishops of Canterbury it owes even more to the great Benedictine Monastery whose devotional centre it was. But it owes most of all to Thomas à Becket, 'this turbulent priest,' Primate and Chancellor of all England, who was murdered in the chancel of his own cathedral in 1170, due to his support of the Hildebrandine policy which sought to subject national sovereigns to papal imperialism. The murder of Thomas à Becket by the Knights of Henry II was not only a crime: it was a blunder of the greatest magnitude. Canterbury Cathedral, however, reaped immense profits from the transaction. It became rich beyond the dreams of avarice. The body of the canonised martyr was splendidly translated in 1220 and pilgrims from the whole Western world and beyond it benefited by the amazing miracles wrought at the shrine and their offerings provided vast resources for the extension and adornment of the Cathedral.

From the nave the cathedral ascends tier upon tier to its furthermost eastern extension, the 'Corona' of St. Thomas. Of the nave itself Mr. Ross Williamson writes, after noting that it is the work of Chaucer's contemporary, Henry Yevele, that it is

> 'the very finest product of English Gothic . . . the finest interior now remaining in England and one of the greatest masterpieces of art in the world' (p. 14).

The interior of the Cathedral suffered desolating damage when its incalculable treasures were looted by Henry VIII in 1538. Archbishop Laud, our first Anglo-Catholic and Arminian Archbishop of Canterbury, spent great sums of money in re-furnishing its chancel in accordance with his liturgical ideals. This produced another disastrous attack on the interior of the fabric and not least on its glass in the days of the Puritan Commonwealth.

This book, containing so many matters of interest, emphasizes the extraordinary value of the archiepiscopal library at Canterbury. It, like the Minster, has suffered grievously. Some of its treasures may to-day be found in the British Museum, others in Cambridge, others in Stockholm, and one of its volumes, Mr. Ross Williamson asserts 'has even got as far as Tokyo.'

H.D.A.M.

IN MEMORIAM

FREDERICK VICTOR FISHER

On January 30 a valued member of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union passed away at his home in Hampstead. His social and political activities were of a most varied kind, as recorded in the obituary notice of *The Times*, February 2.

> 'In 1898 he became a member of the Eighty Club and worked with the late W. M. Thompson in the formation of the National Democratic League. A year later he became a member of the Fabian Society, and in 1908 he joined the Social Democratic Party. Disagreement over the policy of pacifism led him to resign from the British Socialist Party in

1914, and thereafter he devoted his energies to the Socialist National Defence Committee, of which he was founder and honorary secretary. . . . . In 1918 he initiated the National Democratic Party as the Parliamentary expression of the British Workers' League; became honorary director of the Society for the Study of Religions and editor of *Religions*, the Society's official review. . . .

He was a Fellow of the Royal Empire Society and a Fellow of the Royal Economic Society. In addition to giving many lectures he published a number of books on political and economic subjects and contributed many articles to different periodicals.'

In his propaganda on behalf of a World-Religion he was closely associated with the late Sir Francis Younghusband. H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

EDWIN J. SNOW

Sir,

The name of Mr. E. J. Snow will be familiar to members of the Modern Churchmen's Union as the Assistant Secretary who regularly sent out the notices of subscriptions due, etc., and always in a beautiful handwriting. Members will be sorry to learn of his last illness and recent decease and I write as Chairman of the Council of the Union to express the sorrow we all feel at his passing.

Mr. Snow was formerly the Librarian at Middle Claydon and used to help the Rev. R. G. Griffith in many ways, as he was himself keen on our Union and its ideals. When he retired from his work he became our Assistant Secretary and in this capacity rendered valuable service. Visitors to our Conferences were used to seeing him and charmed with his old-world courtesy to all. Both young and old found him a helpful friend, always ready to get to know someone who was only a name from the office files to begin with and as a result of meeting and a talk went away feeling they had a personal link with headquarters.

At the last meeting of the Council of the Union his death was reported and I was asked to write this letter to make public our regret at his passing, and our thankfulness for all he so cheerfully did for us.

HARRY BAILEY
Chairman of M.C.U. Council

HENRY JOSEPH TRUEMAN

Sir,

I should like to supplement your obituary notice of the Rev. H. J. Trueman in your December issue. He was a gifted musician and made a most influential use of his gifts in his pastoral work. He was educated at Harrow, King's College, London, and after graduating at Clare College, Cambridge, in 1884, he stayed up to work for his Mus.B. and was ordained in 1887 to a curacy in Southampton. There, his preaching drew more than the neighbourhood; and the enthusiasm of the Services, led by a choir of girls, often singing hymn-tunes specially composed by Trueman for that congregation, brought reputation to his Mission Chapel. Hard years of strenuous parish work resulted in a severe breakdown from which he recovered in Italy, reading Browning and renewing the family friendship with George Macdonald and his wife.

Having preached in Salisbury Cathedral in 1894, when John Wordsworth was bishop, Trueman was offered, and accepted, charge of St. Mark's—a

parish newly formed in that city and with a church only partly built. A report in a local paper speaks of the new curate-in-charge as 'a young man who has caught the impassioned spirit of a great temperance and social reformer.'

For the next twenty years his work was to be the building up of his church, vicarage and parish, and leaving them free of debt. His relations with his parishioners (he called on every one in the parish) and with the clergy of other denominations were characterized by a friendliness not appreciated by all his fellow clergy, but which remains as a pleasing memory with those who have survived him. Among his activities was a remarkable series of musical plays, written to finance the church schools and performed by the children in the City Hall. These brought him friendships in the teaching world. Not a note of the music, songs, choruses, dances, ballets, was ever written down, though news of them brought appeals for publication from all parts of the country.

The music of Greig made an instant appeal to Henry Trueman, and one of his most striking compositions in later years was an elegy in music, set to his own words, on the dramatic depositing of Grieg's ashes in the rocks above his beloved Norwegian Fjord.

But Trueman's chief interest lay in the church itself. The beautiful and reverent services and the bold preaching—often on unpopular subjects and challenging thought along unaccustomed lines—met with enthusiastic response. In 1898 he was invited to preach in Westminster Abbey.

With the completion of the Salisbury church of St. Mark, he left as a memorial to his family a window dedicated to three saints who bear the names of his grandmother, his mother and his aunt.

He served until his death as a Governor of Ripon Hall to which he left a legacy of £300.

MARY E. FAIRBAIRNS

ELECTION TO THE COUNCIL OF THE M.C.U.

Sir,

The Annual Meeting and Service of the Union will be held on Wednesday, May 26th, and particulars will be sent to members in due course. Nominations for election to the Council, with the names of the seconders, should be sent to me to reach me not later than April 24th.

The following retires after serving for three years on the Council, and is not eligible for re-election, but may be co-opted for a year, *viz.* Rev. Dr. G. W. Butterworth.

The following retire after serving by co-option, and are eligible for election or for co-option, *viz.*: Mr. J. F. Aitchison, Miss Helen Barlow, Mr. Leslie Brooks, Sir Wilfred Garrett, Mr. M. S. Gotch, Rev. J. D. Pearce Higgins, Rev. F. W. Moyle, Rev. H. E. Root, Rev. T. J. Wood.

There are ten vacancies to be filled by election, which is for a period of three years.

T. J. WOOD,
Hon. Secretary,
The Modern Churchmen's Union

Charlbury Vicarage,
Oxford.

IMPORTANT CORRECTION

In the December issue of the *Modern Churchman*, Vol. XLIII, p. 257, in the eleventh line from the bottom read *twenty* instead of *two*.

ED. *M.C.*